DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 528 EC 160 051

AUTHOR Mitchell, Patricia Bruce, Ed.
TITLE A Policymaker's Guide to Issues in Gifted and Talented Education.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Boards of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 72p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of State Boards of Education, 444 N. Capitol St., N.W., Washington, DC 20001 ($7.50 each, $20.00 set of 3).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Gifted; *Policy Formation; State Legislation; State of the Art Reviews; State Programs; *Talent

ABSTRACT

The book is intended to help policymakers understand issues involved in gifted and talented education. Initial chapters review the state of the art in state and federal policies toward education of gifted and talented students and outline steps in decisionmaking regarding policy development (determining the framework, making basic decisions, refining and expanding basic policy decisions, and translating policies into action). The succeeding seven papers detail the services provided by the states of California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington. Information in the profiles is organized according to the following topics: state statutory and administrative policy, statistical profile, identification procedures, allocation and distribution of funds, state central services, program standards and current programs, professional preparation, program evaluation, degree of service provision, past and future, and major stimulants for change and growth. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Issues in Gifted and Talented Education

ED233528

EC160051

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Mitchell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Association of State Boards of Education gratefully acknowledges the editorial assistance of Judith C. Heffner in the publication of this book.

A Policymaker's Guide to Issues in Gifted and Talented Education

Patricia Bruce Mitchell
Editor

A Publication of

National Association of State Boards of Education
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
1981

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Brief Overview of National Efforts in Gifted and Talented Education 2
Patricia Bruce Mitchell

Policymaking for Gifted and Talented Education: An Analysis of Issues and a Suggested Process for Making Decisions 8
Patricia Bruce Mitchell

California State Profile 30
Jack Mosier

Connecticut State Profile 36
William Vassar

Idaho State Profile 42
Genelle Christensen

Illinois State Profile 47
Wilma Lund

North Carolina State Profile 51
Cornelia Tongue

Ohio State Profile 56
George Fichter

Washington State Profile 60
Mary Henri Fisher

Introduction

At their annual meeting in 1976, the membership of the National Association of State Boards of Education established the education of gifted and talented children as the Association's fourth priority of forty critical issues in education. This action represented the recognition by state policy formulators of the importance of improved services to the gifted child population and the specific need for information services to state boards to achieve this end. NASBE responded by soliciting a grant to work intensively with six western states in improving policies and programs for the gifted. As additional states requested the technical assistance, NASBE expanded the project, so that what began in the west has spread across the country and out to the territories.

Over the past five years, NASBE has interviewed state board members, state legislators and their staff, chief state school officers and their staff, state education association leaders, local school board members, local superintendents and their staff, principals, teachers, parents and students in many states. These meetings have focused on discussing two key questions, "What does your state need to do to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children? How can policymakers provide leadership in this area?"

After thousands of hours of discussions, one conclusion has emerged. Policymakers' support is crucial to school's efforts to develop the abilities of their gifted and talented children, but the *best* approach for providing that support can only be determined by examining the unique needs, resources and "ways of doing things" in that state or district.

This book is designed to help you, the policymaker, determine the best course of action for your particular situation by:

- giving you an overview of current state and federal efforts for educating gifted and talented children;
- outlining a suggested process for analyzing your policy needs and evolving a fiscally, politically and pedagogically feasible approach to meeting those needs;
- analyzing some of the critical policy issues in the education of gifted and talented children; and
- providing detailed descriptions of different state approaches to education of the gifted and talented.

While this book cannot provide a single prescription for leadership, it will help you ask the right questions. With your motivation to find answers, and time, you will succeed in encouraging schools and communities to develop the potential of our most able children.

Patricia Bruce Mitchell
Editor

Brief Overview of National Efforts in Gifted and Talented Education

Patricia Bruce Mitchell

The following summary is presented to help you, the policymaker, understand the state-of-the-art on the state and federal policies regarding the education of gifted and talented children. The information was compiled from the results of two national surveys and from information that was voluntarily reported to NASBE over the past few years.

At The State Level

As of June 1981, most states had demonstrated a commitment to the education of gifted and talented children through policies, special funding, and full-time personnel in the state department of education.

Policies

All but five states have legislation which either specifically addresses the education of gifted and talented children or provides a special appropriation for gifted education programs. In most of the states the provision of special programs to the gifted and talented is optional for local districts. The seventeen (17) states listed below have reported that in legislation, or in rules and regulations, local school districts are required to provide services to gifted and talented children.

Alabama	Louisiana	Pennsylvania
Alaska	Nevada	South Dakota
Arizona	New Jersey	Tennessee
Florida	New Mexico	Virginia
Georgia	North Carolina	West Virginia
Kansas	Oklahoma	

Relationship Between Gifted Education And Handicapped Education

In the following fourteen (14) states, gifted and talented education is closely tied to the mandates for handicapped education and the requirements for local district programs for both groups are similar:

Alabama	Kansas	Pennsylvania
Alaska	Louisiana	South Dakota
Florida	Nevada	Tennessee
Georgia	New Mexico	West Virginia
Idaho	North Carolina	

In the following twenty-five (25) state departments of education, the program for the gifted is administratively housed in the unit responsible for education of handicapped children.

Alabama	Kansas	North Carolina
Alaska	Louisiana	North Dakota
Arkansas	Maine	Ohio
Connecticut	Mississippi	Oregon
Delaware	Nevada	Pennsylvania
Florida	New Hampshire	South Dakota
Georgia	New Jersey	Washington
Hawaii	New Mexico	West Virginia
Idaho		

State Level Funding

As of 1981, most states had an annual appropriation of between one quarter million and one-million dollars for gifted and talented education. Only five states had not specifically earmarked funds for these programs. The 25 states listed below will spend one million dollars or more of state funds for the 1981-82 school year on

gifted and talented education. The states marked with an (*) are spending more than five million dollars per year.

Alabama	Kentucky	Oklahoma
Alaska	Louisiana	*Pennsylvania
*California	*Mississippi	South Carolina
Connecticut	Missouri	Tennessee
*Florida	*New Mexico	Texas
*Georgia	New York	Virginia
Idaho	*North Carolina	Washington
*Illinois	Ohio	West Virginia
Kansas		

As figures on the number of gifted and talented students served are difficult to obtain, an estimate of state expenditures per child cannot be computed. In states where services are mandated and major state funding is provided, the average per pupil in earmarked funds ranges from $300 to over $1000.

The method of funding varies across the states. Those states which mandate programs for the gifted as a part of their policies on exceptional children generally distribute the funds for gifted programs using the same formula or reimbursement system as programs for the handicapped.

Most states which link gifted and handicapped, but do not mandate programs for the gifted, also use a similar formula or reimbursement system for both categories of students.

In states where handicapped and gifted are separated in policies, the most common method for distributing state funds to local agencies is through a special categorical program. Many of these states reimburse districts, on a per pupil or approved costs basis, for programs which are approved by the state. Some states, particularly those which have recently enacted state policies for the gifted, use a competitive grant process. One state, Nebraska, funds gifted education as part of their foundation support formula. Each gifted or talented child in an approved program receives 1.25 times the annual per pupil expenditure.

A few states fund inservice training activities for teachers of gifted children or partially reimburse local districts for costs of personnel who provide technical assistance related to programs for the gifted.

State Level Personnel

Six states have more than one person with full-time responsibilities in gifted and talented education. Thirty-two (32) of the remaining states have at least one full-time person in this area.

At the Federal Level

The federal government began its involvement with education of gifted and talented children in 1970 when Congress mandated a status report. In 1972, following the report by U.S.O.E. Commissioner Sidney Marland, the U.S. Office of Gifted and Talented was created. With the enactment of the Special Projects Act in 1974, the U.S. Congress established a grant program with an annual appropriation of $2½ million. Those funds were used to make grants to almost all of the state education agencies, to 85 local education agencies, to six model projects and to five agencies which conducted leadership training activities.

Gifted And Talented Children's Education Act of 1978

In 1978, with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.), Congress shifted gifted and talented education out of Special Projects into Part A of the Title IX—Additional Programs. The authorization for the program was $25 million for Fiscal Year 1979, with an increased amount for each succeeding year leading to $50 million for Fiscal Year 1983. The actual appropria-

tion for FY 79 and FY 80 was $6.2 million and $5.7 million was appropriated for FY 81.

"The Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978" included several key revisions from the Special Projects Act:

- **A Revised Definition**—The definition for gifted and talented children changed slightly from the one established in the Special Projects Act. The old definition was:

  "Gifted and talented" means children and, where applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary, or secondary level as
  (1) possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability or in the performing and visual arts or psychomotor ability;
  (2) needing differentiated education or services (beyond those being provided by the regular school system to the average student) in order to realize those potentialities.

  The definition used in the 1978 act is:

  "gifted and talented children" means children and, whenever applicable youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary, or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific, academic, or leadership ability, or in the performing and visual arts, and who by reason thereof, require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school.

  You will note that the psychomotor category was deleted, and there were some significant wording changes in the last sentence on the need for services.

- **Grants To States Distributed To Local Districts On Competitive Basis**—When a state received a federal grant for gifted and talented education it could only retain 10% of that grant for state administration costs. Ninety percent went to local education agencies via a competitive grant process. All states applying for a grant received a minimum of $50,000.
- **Special Emphasis On Disadvantaged Gifted**—Congress was very concerned about the need for special services for gifted and talented children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Therefore, the 1978 Act earmarked half of the funds going through the state to local districts for that purpose. In their application for federal funds, the states provided a plan which outlined how no less than half of the funds given to local districts would go to programs with a component for the disadvantaged.

Education Consolidation And Improvement Act Of 1981

Under the Grants Consolidation enacted by Congress in 1981, funds for education of the gifted have been merged with 29 other programs under Chapter Two. Thus, there are no longer minimum state grants, requirements to serve the disadvantaged gifted or a Commissioner's Discretionary Program for gifted education to support previous activities in training personnel, operating information clearinghouses or establishing model projects.

In summary, federal efforts in advocacy and assistance to state and local agencies have undoubtedly led to the current growth in programs for the gifted across the country. The Office of Gifted and Talented, and the Office of Special Education for the Handicapped which housed that office prior to Fall, 1981 are to be commended for their leadership. The limited funds of the office have been carefully awarded, and the programs funded have been unusually successful in multiplying their outcomes.

The shift of federal funds for gifted education into the grant consolidation will sharply reduce or eliminate the federal role as a catalyst in this area. Gifted and talented education is clearly an education issue that has been and must continue as a state and local level concern.

Summary of Current State Support for Gifted and Talented Children

State	Appropriation		Pupils Served in G/T Programs FY 1981* (**)	Services Mandated	Special Teacher Certification	
	FY 1981	FY 1982			Mandated	Under Debate
Alabama	$ *	$ *	9,281	yes	yes	
Alaska	2,580,000	2,580,000	3,744	yes		
Arizona	*	*	N/A	yes		
Arkansas	280,000	300,000	1,000			yes
California	16,000,000	16,000,000	155,538			
Colorado	50,000	-0-	10,461			
Connecticut	4,200,000	N/A	12,000			yes
Delaware	550,000	580,000	2,500			
Florida	17,000,000	N/A	30,683	yes	yes	
Georgia	13,140,000	15,320,000	39,941	yes	yes	
Hawaii	90,000	110,000	6,000			
Idaho	1,260,000*	N/A	2,500			
Illinois	6,503,000	6,503,000	70,000			yes
Indiana	70,000	190,000	23,000			yes
Iowa	150,000	-0-	N/A			
Kansas	2,160,000	2,470,000	5,175	yes	yes	
Kentucky	1,200,000	1,900,000	9,208			yes
Louisiana	2,500,000	3,500,000	8,140	yes	yes	
Maine	100,000	N/A	1,500			
Maryland	600,000	530,000	24,605			
Massachusetts	-0-	-0-	19,000			
Michigan	530,000	530,000	N/A			
Minnesota	600,000	580,000	52,000			
Mississippi	6,000,000	7,000,000	8,500		yes	
Missouri	2,330,000	2,500,000	8,868			yes
Montana	-0-	200,000	2,000			
Nebraska	500,000	N/A	N/A			yes
Nevada	800,000	950,000	3,452	yes		yes
New Hampshire	-0-	-0-	1,500			
New Jersey	100,000	100,000	35,000	yes		yes
New Mexico	4,000,000	5,000,000	2,932	yes	yes	
New York	1,500,000	2,960,000	104,000			
North Carolina	16,000,000	16,000,000	55,492	yes	yes	
North Dakota	110,000	260,000	750		yes	
Oklahoma	1,190,000	1,800,000	5,000	yes		yes

Summary of Current State Support for Gifted and Talented Children

State	Appropriation		Pupils Served in G/T Programs FY 1981* (**)	Services Mandated	Special Teacher Certification	
	FY 1981	FY 1982			Mandated	Under Debate
Ohio	3,130,000	3,200,000	30,000			
Oregon	630,000	334,000	8,703			yes
Pennsylvania	28,000,000	30,000,000	60,000	yes		
Rhode Island	320,000	530,000	2,500			
South Carolina	1,480,000	1,630,000	11,000			
South Dakota	50,000	125,000	520	yes		yes
Tennessee	2,500,000	2,000,000	10,000	yes	yes	
Texas	3,000,000	3,600,000	28,000			
Utah	570,000	block grant	10,315			yes
Vermont	10,000	10,000	1,000			
Virginia	2,370,000	2,350,000	N/A	yes		
Washington	1,390,000	block grant	13,329			
West Virginia	2,890,000	3,290,000	4,500	yes	yes	
Wisconsin	-0-	-0-	12,000			
Wyoming	-0-	500,000	800			
District of Columbia	35,000	35,000	3,000			

*Funded through special education—formula breakdown not available.

**Figure may include estimates made by state director of gifted programs of students in any type of provision/program, or the figure may be limited to only those students receiving services which meet standards for gifted and talented education.

Policymaking for Gifted and Talented Education: An Analysis of Issues and a Suggested Process for Making Decisions

Patrícia Bruce Mitchell

If the title of this section intrigues you, you are probably a member of a board of education, a legislator, or a key staff member in an education agency and you are concerned about improving educational opportunities for our nation's gifted and talented children.

This article will help outline a series of policy decisions about education for the gifted and talented. The article is like a guide for an exercise program: it cannot do the work for you, but it can help to focus your activities so that you achieve the greatest gains for your time and effort.

There are four basic steps in the process of making decisions on policies and programs in any area of concern in education. This process is particularly useful for policymaking in gifted and talented education because most states and local districts have only recently begun to build systematic programs in this area. The four steps are:

1. Determining the framework for those policies through an examination of what is currently being done and what needs to be done;
2. Making basic policy decisions;
3. Refining and expanding the basic policy decisions;
4. Translating policies into action.

This process has been successfully used in many states. It works because it helps policymakers clarify what it is they want to see happen, and then helps them develop policies which match the available resources, student needs and political realities of their state.

There are two special notes for the readers. First, the word "policy" is used as a generic term and refers to a variety of documents that either govern or guide actions at the state and/or local level. State statutes, rules and regulations, board action or policy statements, and state plans are all examples of "policies." Secondly, the word "state" is used frequently because this article is primarily intended for people making decisions at the state level. Local board members and administrators should still find that most of the information is applicable to their situation. The process of making decisions is certainly the same, but the issues may differ, particularly during phases two and three.

You may wish to skim the article first to see what sections are best for the information you need now. Then keep this book handy, for it will provide some guidance as you move through the process. At the end of each section is a summary of that section, so that you need only read those summaries if your time is limited.

This article does not offer the comfort of known solutions. There are no models you can copy exactly, or even "cut and paste" together to create your policies. There are no simple prescriptions for successful policies and programs. Perhaps knowing that there are no answers will be helpful. It should free you to be more innovative. Somehow that seems most appropriate, that we must use our own creativity and leadership abilities if we are to recognize and provide for the talents of our children.

Phase 1: Determining The Framework

Before you begin developing or revising policies for gifted and talented education you should determine: "what is" or where you are now; and "what should be" or where you would like to be in five years.

"What is" is described by statistical information on existing programs and children served, as well as by the opinions of people involved in these programs. "What should be" will be determined by you, as policymakers, after reflecting on the views of your constituents and your own perceptions of what you can realistically attain for gifted and talented children. Some of the questions that may help you determine "what is" and "what should be" are outlined below.

"What Is"

It might be useful to visit some gifted programs so that you can get a sense of what happens to the "typical gifted child" who is being served in a program. How were they identified? How often and for how long do they receive special help each week? What are they learning in the programs? What happens when they move up to the next grade? If it is not possible to make an on-site visit, a knowledgeable staff member could describe a few "typical" children so that you can visualize the day-to-day functioning of their programs. In any case, the following questions should help you focus your initial efforts.

Current Local Programs

- How many and what types of districts/schools have programs?
- How many children are served in the first three grades, the next three, middle school, high school?
- What types of abilities are served in gifted and talented programs? (i.e., high intellectual, academic, artistic, leadership or creative thinking)
- How many and what types of programs serve the gifted and talented? (i.e., supplements to regular classes, part-time classes, resource rooms, full-time classes)
- How much do the programs cost over and above normal per pupil costs, and what are the sources for those funds? (federal, state, local or other)
- Are there gifted and talented programs in your state that are especially well respected and serve as models for other schools?
- What training is available for administrative and instructional staff?
- How are the programs being evaluated?
- Are the persons conducting the programs sharing information regarding their efforts with other persons in the district and the state on a regular basis? How do they do this?
- Where are the gaps? How many and what types of districts/schools do not have gifted programs? Which grade levels are not receiving services? Which types of abilities are being ignored?

Current State Programs

The answers to this second set of questions will help you determine how the state is helping to support local efforts.

- What are the current statutory and regulatory policies which govern gifted and talented education?
- What is the current level of state appropriations for gifted and talented programs?
- Which policies and funding for other educational programs provide direct benefits to gifted and talented children? (e.g., innovative programs, arts in education, programs for the poor and minorities, etc.)
- What services does the state department of education provide to local districts? (e.g., consultant help, workshops, resource/reference materials, etc.)
- Which state organizations and agencies offer training and technical assistance? (e.g., institutions of higher education, intermediate/regional education units, teacher centers, professional organizations, etc.)
- Are statewide efforts being evaluated and if so, how?
- Is there a statewide system for disseminating useful information to school personnel who are developing and operating gifted programs?

Perception Of Current Programs

This third set of questions will help you and your fellow policymakers move from "what is" to contemplating "what needs to happen." The information will require some extra effort to gather, as the questions are not easily answered.

However, it will be invaluable to you in determining the framework for policy decisions.

- In districts/schools which have programs, what do the administrators, teachers, students and their parents think are the strengths and weaknesses of the programs?
- In districts/schools which do not have programs, are efforts underway to develop programs? If not, what is discouraging them from providing special services to gifted and talented children?
- Do most of the programs meet at least the minimum standards of quality as judged by national leaders in the education of gifted and talented children?
- What do the districts/schools feel they would like to do over the next three to five years to improve and expand programs?
- In the opinion of concerned district/school personnel, what leadership could the state provide that would facilitate and encourage better services to the gifted and talented?

"What Should Be"

The data on current programs and the reports on perceptions of those programs will form an essential starting point for this part of phase one. But the answer to the question, "what should be?" must come from you the policymakers.

- What do you envision for your state's gifted and talented children? Do you want a variety of services that can reach and serve all of these children? or do you see services being developed for a limited number of children? If so, which group(s) are to be helped?
- What priority rating would you currently give the gifted and talented?
- What do other key policymakers and opinion leaders in the state think about the gifted and talented? Which ones are likely to be supporters?
- What are the competing programs that may have higher priority? Why?
- Given the priorities and the political and economic factors in your state, what goals do you wish to set for improving education for gifted and talented children?

While it is necessary to be politically and economically realistic when determining next steps for gifted and talented education, you should not *overestimate* potential barriers to your goals. Most of your fellow policymakers are likely to be neutral on the issue and are more easily persuaded to be supportive than one might predict. Developing the outstanding abilities of gifted children appeals to most people's sense of logic, as well as to their desire to be sensitive to the needs of all special children. Policymakers in this country are also beginning to focus on quality in education. A growing interest in gifted and talented programs seems to be part of this push for excellence.

Summary Of Phase I: Determining The Framework

Goals:

To find out what is currently being done for gifted and talented children in your state

To determine what needs to be done to improve the education of gifted and talented children

To set basic goals for state/local efforts over the next three to five years

Issues To Be Considered:

Data regarding existing local programs that are serving gifted and talented children

Existing state policies and services which support gifted and talented education

Perceptions of the effectiveness of current state and local programs

Potential for fiscal and political support for gifted and talented programs from other policymakers and education leaders

Decisions To Be Made:

Priority rating of issue

What you as policymakers envision for gifted and talented children in your state over the next three to five years

Suggested Process:

1. Policymakers and staff formulate a "study plan" prior to the collection of data. Person(s) responsible for the study and timetables are designated. Policymakers tell staff their preferences regarding the study and information they would like to see collected.
2. Staff collects the data and reports to policymakers on specific state needs and the resources (both existing and potential) for meeting those needs.
3. Policymakers reflect on report and decide on priority rating of issue and basic goals for next three to five years.

Phase 2: Making Basic Decisions

In Phase One you roughly mapped out the terrain for future policy development. "What is" set your starting point and "what should be" pinpointed your destination. This second phase is a continuation of the mapping process. It involves making basic decisions on critical issues on gifted and talented education:

- Do you want mandated or permissive policies?
- Will gifted and talented education become part of special education, be included in another category, or placed in a category by itself?
- Who is to be defined as gifted and talented?
- How will you distribute state funds to program developers?

Some of the decisions may already have been made for you. For example, your state may be very happy with current policies which relate gifted and talented programs to the education of other exceptional children. The method of funding may be determined by previously established state funding patterns. Whether or not to mandate programs will probably be determined by the political acceptability of that policy. Some of the options your state may wish to consider under each of the four basic decisions are outlined below.

Mandated vs. Permissive Programs

If your state is committed to providing at least minimal special services to meet the needs of gifted and talented children, and if you feel that those minimal services will not be provided without a state mandate, then you and your fellow policymakers may wish to require that districts provide programs. The mandate can be conveyed through statutory language, through state board policy and/or through a state rule or regulation, depending upon the policy structure in your state.

A mandate is not a magic wand. It will not turn schools without programs for the gifted and talented into schools with good programs. Mandates are more like matches. They can ignite commitment to serving the gifted and talented, but their effect can be short-lived unless fueled by additional support, i.e., adequate funding, technical assistance to program developers and training opportunities for school personnel.

A paper mandate also must become a public policy. With all the "shall provide" in today's educational policies, districts may need to be reminded periodically that the state is committed to gifted and talented education. State education agencies and boards have demonstrated their commitment in a variety of ways. Some have conducted workshops on gifted and talented education at annual conferences for local school boards, superintendents and other administrative groups. In Nevada, the state board of education and department recently sponsored an invitational conference on gifted education for the school board chairperson and the superintendent of each of the school districts. Such visible state leadership not only is helpful in implementing a mandate; it also facilitates program development even when policies are permissive.

Gifted Education As A Part Of Special Education

Education of gifted and talented children does not fit neatly into existing program categories. Many states feel that it belongs in special education. Others believe that it should be included in general curricular and instructional programs.

If you are contemplating moving gifted and talented education into, or out of, special education then you may wish to review some of the potential advantages and disadvantages of that option.

Advantages. There are many persuasive arguments for grouping the gifted and talented in with handicapped children under an umbrella of "exceptional child education."

- **There is consistency in program philosophy.** Gifted and talented children, like the handicapped, are a unique population who differ significantly from average children. Their needs have not been as widely recognized as those of the handicapped, but they are just as "exceptional." Thus, the principles of special education for the handicapped also apply to the gifted: highly individualized instruction and a curriculum that is adapted to meet unique needs. By placing gifted education under special education policymakers will make it clear that they support the philosophy that gifted and talented children are exceptional learners and thus need services beyond those provided in the regular classroom.
- **Existing systems for delivering programs can serve both groups.** Because the precepts for services to the handicapped and the gifted are the same, a single administrative structure can be used for both. This will reduce the number of administrative personnel and other scarce resources (e.g., school psychologist) that would be required if the programs were administered separately.
- **The funding mechanisms will work well for both types of programs.** Getting dollars where they are needed is a complex problem. It is more complex for exceptional children due to variation in types of special learning needs and the scattering of these children across grade levels and across local districts. Thus, a single system for funding both programs will help districts provide for their exceptional learners. A single system will also stabilize support for gifted education. In states where gifted programs are not funded as a part of education for exceptional children, they usually receive categorical aid and thus are very vulnerable to budget cutbacks.

Disadvantages. There are some potential disadvantages to grouping the gifted in special education. Some states that have used this approach have experienced some of the following difficulties:

- **Gifted programs may have to take a back seat to handicapped programs.** Due to the demanding requirements of P.L. 94-142, Section 504 of the 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act and state statutes, education agencies are frequently too busy with services to the handicapped to pay adequate attention to gifted education. Also, funding systems for special education in

some states limit the number of students or programs that can be counted for state funding purposes. If a district with limited funds must choose between expanding programs for the handicapped or for the gifted, the gifted frequently lose.

- **Many educators of the handicapped resist the notion of including the gifted in special education.** Educators, parents and other concerned citizens fought long and hard to get free and appropriate education for all handicapped children. Many feel there are less than adequate human and fiscal resources to provide quality services for the handicapped. Thus, they are very nervous about having those limited resources stretched to reach children they feel do not need special help. Also, educators and parents of the gifted and talented are not always enthusiastic about including their children in special education. They often feel that gifted and talented programs will always play "second fiddle" to services for the handicapped.

The decision regarding where to place education of gifted and talented children in state policies and administrative structures should be based on a careful analysis of programmatic reasons and political realities. The question policymakers must answer is, "where will the special needs of gifted and talented children be best served given the situation in our state?"

Like the decision of whether or not to mandate programs, the decision about program placement is only one of many important actions to be taken. Even if you feel that your placement strategy is optimal and you have real commitment from staff in that program area, you cannot sit back and expect everything to fall neatly into place. Careful placement is just one part of a complex formula for promoting gifted education.

Definitions Of Gifted And Talented Children

A state definition of "gifted and talented" serves many purposes. It states which types of human abilities are to receive special development in your schools. It also forms the basis for policies on identification and placement of children in special programs. Thus, the definition helps to draw the line—at least for the purposes of state funding—between those who will be called "gifted and talented" and those who will not. Finally, it limits the population to a size that can be served with available human and fiscal resources.

Unfortunately, we still have difficulty defining gifted and talented. The problem with a definition is caused by the nature of human abilities. They do not come in three sizes—a little, a lot and average. Abilities range along a continuum. Definitions of "average", "above average" and "gifted" are attempts at demarcating categories on that continuum.

Despite the difficulties with setting a definition for your state, someone must decide who will and who will not be eligible for state funding for gifted and talented programs. You, as policymakers, will have to develop the definition. Your task might be simplified if you first give some thought to how you might resolve three issues that are basic to any definition of gifted and talented: 1) whether to set a broad or narrow definition; 2) how to limit the population to be served; and 3) whether to use national or local standards for comparing your students.

Narrow vs. Broad Definition. Your state may wish to limit your "gifted" definition to include only those children with outstanding intellectual/academic abilities. Several states have chosen this narrow definition. They feel that their resources are too limited to serve all children who have special abilities, so they have focused their efforts on children who are exceptionally intelligent and/or can excell in academic areas.

Most states, however, have opted for a broader definition that recognizes other abilities that we value: leadership, creative thinking, artistic expression, in addition to intellectual and academic talents.

The advantages of the narrow definition are several:

- A narrow definition will focus the available resources of the state on abilities traditionally accepted as being "school" concerns—intellectual and academic development.
- The percentage of the school population that would be selected under the narrow definition would be smaller, making it possible to operate quality gifted programs with less funds.
- Intellectual and academic abilities can be measured on standardized tests. If the programs serve children with exceptional abilities in these areas, standardized test scores can help educators make difficult decisions regarding who to place in the programs.

The broader definition also has several advantages:

- A broader definition will convey the state's intent that abilities such as leadership, creative thinking and artistic expression should be recognized and developed by schools.
- Gifted children who come from minority populations and other culturally different groups—and who may have exceptional abilities that are not evidenced in their academic schoolwork—are more likely to be identified and served if the state's definition recognizes a variety of talents.
- A broader definition provides more flexibility to a local district in establishing gifted programs that meet its interests and needs.

There is a third alternative for states who want to use a broader definition but feel they have inadequate funds to support programs for the talented categories (leadership, creative thinking, visual and performing arts, psychomotor abilities). The state can develop a plan that phases in programs for talent areas gradually. Thus, the intellectually and academically gifted can be served first. After a set number of months, or years, one or more talent areas can be designated as eligible for state funding.

A fourth alternative would be to use the broad definition and encourage local districts to develop their own plan for developing programs for all ability areas over a 3 to 5-year period. The state could agree to pick up a limited percentage of the costs of those programs, depending upon what is available in state funding and how that could best be distributed to local programs. This leads to the second major issue in setting a state definition, the percentage of the school population that will be given additional funding for gifted and talented programs.

Percentage of Population to Be Served. All states have to limit the population that will be eligible for services through gifted and talented programs. There are simply not enough funds available to cover the costs for special programs for one-quarter or more of the school population. A gifted program is designed to help those children whose exceptional abilities cannot be adequately met in the regular classroom. Only a small percentage of our children fall into this category.

A few states use a score on an intelligence and/or achievement test to set the cutoff. For example, Florida's policy states that a child must have an intelligence quotient of two standard deviations or more above the mean on an individually administered standardized intelligence test. Thus only about 2% of their population would qualify as gifted for state funding purposes.

Most states set a limit by stipulating a percentage of a school district's enrollment that can be included in state-funded efforts. The percentage set by states ranges as high as 10% in Nebraska and as low as 1% in West Virginia. The average, however, is between 3 and 5 percent of the school enrollment.

Using a percentage limitation is generally preferable to letting a specific test score draw the line between gifted children and "others." Test score limitations pose problems for districts with higher numbers of disadvantaged children. Also, the

percentage approach gives more flexibility to schools in finding children with outstanding abilities in areas such as leadership, creativity and the arts. The percentage limitations will work best for state budgeting/appropriation decisions as it provides a more predictable figure of numbers of children who will be eligible for special state funding.

Local vs. National Standards. If your state's definition limits the population of intellectually and/or academically gifted to a specified percentile or score on a standardized test, then you must decide what criteria will be used as the basis of comparison. For example, if you want your intellectually gifted program to serve the top 2%, you must decide if those children must be in the top 2% of children across the state or country, or if they are to be in the top 2% of children in their schools or districts.

In many districts the "average" score made by students on a standardized intelligence or achievement test will be close to the national average. But in some districts, particularly those with high numbers of disadvantaged children, students may score below the national average. Similarly, in other districts the average student will score above the national average.

A national standard policy defines giftedness as being the uppermost range of scores in a standardized test, as reported by the publishers of the test. The chief advantage to using a national standard for defining giftedness is common acceptability. Most people are accustomed to defining the gifted as those who have an IQ of 130 or above on a standardized intelligence test and/or a score at the 98th percentile or above on a standardized achievement test.

The primary disadvantage of policies which base identification of the gifted on national standards is that such policies will tend to unfairly exclude children from poor and minority populations.

Some programs have used national standards and have tried to compensate for the problems of disadvantaged gifted. In some cases the cutoff score has been lowered for the poor or minority children so that they could be counted as gifted, even if their scores on standard tests were below those made by other children. In some programs, additional points were automatically added to the test scores of disadvantaged children. Then those children were judged on the basis of the standard criteria for gifted programs. The problem with "adjusting" test scores to increase the number of disadvantaged children in gifted programs is that it creates a "second class" of gifted children.

The key advantage to setting policies which use **local standards** is flexibility. If the intelligence of the average student in a district is quite high then the cutoff score on an intelligence test could be set even higher. If the district has a significant percentage of disadvantaged children, officials could choose a lower cutoff score that would still be comparatively high for their population, and would help select the top percentage for gifted programs.

Using the local standard for comparison is defensible. Instruction in a regular classroom in any school across this country is generally geared for the average children in that group. The children who are significantly brighter or significantly slower are the exceptional learners, and do not fully profit from the instruction. For example, the students in school in the Stanford University area of California may have an average IQ of 125. In such a school, the children with an IQ of 132 would probably be just slightly above average. The gifted child would be the one whose IQ is relatively high compared to their peers. Even in such schools where instruction would be on a higher level the gifted child is still likely to be bored and frustrated because they are learning faster than their classmates.

Educators generally do not have problems raising cutoff scores in a local district with higher "average" test scores. The problem comes in applying the local standard or the concept of "relative" giftedness in districts with lower "average" test scores. In a district with an average IQ of 90, a child with an IQ of 125 is an exceptionally able learner. Yet educators are reluctant to allow those schools to set a

cutoff score that is below the nationally-accepted gifted score, i.e., 130 IQ, even though state policies may permit such local flexibility.

There is a problem with using a local standard for defining intellectually or academically gifted children. If a gifted child moves from one district to another in the same state and no longer qualifies as gifted because of a higher cutoff in the new district, the state may receive complaints from that child's parents. However, such situations will not occur with great frequency.

Any policy which limits the number of children to be served in gifted and talented programs will generate complaints from school personnel and parents. Some commonly expressed concerns about funding limitations are described below.

"According to your policy, my child is just 1 point away from being placed into a gifted program. Why can't you let her in?"

A cutoff score or a percentage limitation sets a boundary. Some children will be so close to that line that it seems unfair to exclude them. Ideally, school districts will be flexible enough to have "fuzzy boundaries." That is, children just above and just below the set criteria will be carefully considered on an individual basis. The child's unique needs and abilities should be used in making the decision of whether or not to place them in a gifted program. Once placed in the program the child's response to that program should be watched. If the child is profiting from the program, they should stay. Districts can also respond to the needs of the "borderline gifted children" by providing enrichment activities as part of their regular school program.

Many policymakers at the state and local level fear that parents of above-average and "borderline gifted" children will always push to get their child into the program. This does not occur. A very few, but very vocal, parents will pressure to get their not-quite-gifted child labeled as gifted. If the school tries to include rather than exclude such children they will prevent needless confrontations. Most "borderline" children will determine for themselves that the gifted program is not what they need and will drop out.

"We have more gifted children than you will allow us to have."

This complaint is frequently heard from districts and schools with a high percentage of children from well-educated, more affluent families. Because these children usually do better on standardized tests, the schools and districts may have a large percentage of children whose intelligence test scores are above 130 (the IQ score generally considered to be the beginning point for gifted intellectual abilities), or whose achievement is at or above the 98th percentile on achievement tests.

Some states have resolved this problem by allowing school districts to serve any percentage they wish with local funds. State funds remain earmarked for the percentage specified in state policies and cannot be diluted by being applied to services for additional children.

This approach may appear to some to be needless separation of funding, but it is a way of accounting for state funds. State legislators generally want to know what happened to the dollars they gave out. If those dollars are "thrown into the pot" with local funds, it is difficult to sort out whose dollars did what for gifted children.

Distribution Of State Funds

How to distribute special state funds for gifted and talented programs perplexes many state-level decisionmakers. Unfortunately, very little objective information is available to aid decisionmaking in this area. We do not know of a single study that has examined the effects of different state funding systems on local efforts to educate gifted and talented children. Nor is there sufficient information on the costs of different types of gifted programs.

The best information we can share with you at this time are observations from NASBE's experiences in working intensively with over 20 states on the issue of gifted education.

At present, decisions regarding funding are closely related to decisions on placement of gifted and talented education. States with special education policies that include the gifted and the handicapped tend to have a similar funding system for both groups. Those systems may generate funding based on special weights for exceptional students; level of services offered to "units" of children; reimbursement for a percentage of documented excess costs; or reimbursement for special education personnel.

In states where gifted programs are separate from special education, the programs are usually supported by categorical funds. Nebraska currently funds gifted education as part of the state's foundation formula, and other states are considering this approach.

Since categorical funding is usually inadequate for helping all districts establish and maintain programs, the funding is usually distributed through some type of competitive process. The current state systems for distributing limited funds generally follow one of three basic patterns:

- The districts apply for grants and their applications are judged by a committee of qualified persons. Only the "best" grant applications (i.e., the best written, the most promising ideas, the most capable agencies, etc.) are funded. Some states that use this approach set a limit on the number of dollars any district can request so that more districts can be funded.
- The state sets a dollar figure on the amount a district can receive for each identified gifted child or for each established program. Districts then apply for funding. As many as possible are funded, given the state appropriations. For example, a state may provide $400 per child for up to 3% of the local district's enrollments. Districts that wish to receive the allotment apply to the state, which in turn grants them funding if state standards are met. If the state appropriation is not adequate to fund all district applications, awards are made on a competitive basis.
- The state sets a dollar figure for per pupil or per program funding and the districts apply for those funds. If state funds are inadequate, the state prorates available funds so that each applicant receives some funding.

Needless to say, there are a few obvious disadvantages to each of the above approaches. A state may be able to come up with several alternative systems, but as long as there are more districts that want funds than there are available funds, any system will encounter problems. This ties into our second observation.

The stability of funding is at least as important as the amount of funding in encouraging districts to develop and expand programs. Reliability of funding seems to be a particularly important variable if state funding is to be successful in stimulating local program development. For example, Illinois had some difficulties in the late seventies with slowed program growth which was primarily due to the variability of state funds. Illinois used a system that prorated available funds if the amount requested by local districts exceeded the state's appropriation for that year. Thus, the districts did not know what they would receive as reimbursement for programs. To complicate matters further, the state's appropriation had stagnated at about the same level for fourteen years. Districts actually were receiving fewer dollars each year, and were never sure when they might receive even less than the normal $40 per child due to the prorating of funds.

In our discussions with local district leaders, we frequently heard comments related to the stability of state funding and the "carrot and stick" approach to funding in some states. If the state wants to see programs established to meet the needs of gifted and talented children, we were told, then the state should provide stable financial support. Local administrators have seen other state and federal initiatives

come and go. They seem to be watching gifted education for a while to make sure it is not just a fad. They are not as willing now to invest their energy and time in starting another special program, only to see funds dwindle and disappear just as they are beginning to see the fruits of their labor.

Funding should be balanced with state policies regarding gifted and talented education, and with the amount of services the state can provide to local districts. There are basically three ways that state policymakers can encourage local programs for gifted and talented children. They can adopt policies that encourage (or require) such programs. They can provide funding, and/or they can support the provision of services, such as training and technical assistance, to local districts.

From our experiences, the balancing of policies, funding and services is crucial to systematic, statewide program growth. We have worked with states who were experiencing problems because they had too much of one or two of the elements, and not enough of the others.

Inadequate services seems to be a common cause of imbalance. State legislatures are becoming even less supportive of funding state departments of education to provide training and technical assistance to local districts. This is a serious problem for implementing programs for the gifted and talented, probably more so than for most other special programs because there is a serious shortage of trained personnel. The Office of Gifted and Talented in the U.S. Department of Education has estimated that fewer than 1 in 5 of the teachers currently teaching gifted and talented children in a special program have adequate training. Adding to this severe shortage of trained personnel is a high "burn-out" rate for teachers of the gifted.

Few universities or colleges in a state offer courses in gifted and talented education. Across the country, fewer than two dozen universities regularly graduate students with a master's degree in the area of gifted and talented education. In many states there are less than a half-dozen persons who have the broad experience and training in gifted and talented education that is required for a competent trainer. One of those persons is usually the state department staff person for gifted and talented programs. Thus, if the state department is not given the support it needs to be a key provider for inservice training and for technical assistance, there are few persons or agencies who can fill the gap.

In states where gifted and talented education is still in the early stages of development, the system of funding should be designed to stimulate more funding. Most states are still in the first phases of developing programs for gifted and talented children. They have some, but not enough, state funds. Clearly the key to expansion lies in how they use their limited dollars.

There are a few "do's" and "don'ts" for spending these limited funds. The list has been drawn from the experiences of other states which struggled through the development period.

- Do distribute the limited dollars through a written plan developed with representatives of local districts along with other appropriate persons. Don't throw the money out like bread upon the water, just to see who nibbles.
- Do resist the urge to make the money go around to everyone. Small grants may be a good way to stretch limited resources, but some bigger projects are needed also.
- Do insist on some minimum quality standards, even if the funding awarded is very small. A local school or district should be able to articulate their goals, objectives and strategies, even for a mini-grant. Through training and technical assistance the state should work to constantly improve the level of quality of all state-funded efforts. Those who appropriate the funds, however limited these funds may be, will expect quality programs.

- Do require firm local commitment before giving state support. Some states have found that some type of local match of dollars works well, just so long as the match does not require heavy investment of local funds at the outset of the program.
- Do use some of those limited state funds for training activities. Some policymakers want to see that all the money "goes to children." But if the program is established, and no one has the training needed to provide day-to-day instruction, the money will be wasted. Gifted children rapidly consume the energy and ideas of their teachers. These teachers need to develop their knowledge and skills at the beginning of the program. They will also need help later to cope with the demands of brighter children.

Phase Two involved making basic decisions for your state in several critical issue areas. At the end of this phase you should have completed the rough map for your state's efforts for the next few years. The rest of your efforts in developing or revising state policies will be filling in the details.

Summary of Phase 2: Making Basic Decisions

Goal:

To set parameters for state policies on education of gifted and talented children.

Issues To Be Considered:

Priority rating of issue

Basic goals, as formulated in Phase One, for gifted and talented education

Current policies and programs

State needs and resources, as identified in Phase One

Political and economic factors, both those that would constrain and those that would support programs.

Decisions To Be Made:

Mandatory or permissive state policies?

Incorporate gifted and talented programs and policies with special education or with basic education?

Who will be defined as gifted and talented?

How to distribute special funds for gifted education.

Suggested Process:

1. Policymakers briefly examine these four major decision areas. They determine which need careful consideration for developing or revising policies at this time. They then articulate their concerns in each of these decision areas to staff.
2. Staff prepares issue briefs for decision areas. The briefs should include: current policies (if any); strengths and weaknesses of those policies; and information on programs throughout the state that would be relevant to the decision area. The report should also outline options for new policies and provide information that should be considered by the policymakers when they make their decision.
3. Policymakers decide on policy directions and have staff draft legislation, policy statements, rules and regulations, etc., that will be used in conveying those decisions to others.

Phase 3: Refining and Expanding Policies

The first two phases dealt with setting goals and outlining basic policy directions. Phase Three involves filling in the details by setting requirements and guidelines for local programs.

There are many major and minor issues to be resolved during this phase: state standards for identification of students and for their programs; qualifications of special personnel; responsibilities of education agencies; details for the operation of program funding; other state provisions. This section will not attempt to examine the different perspectives on each issue, but will provide a detailed listing of the issues and some general information for policymakers. The suggested process included in the summation section may serve as a helpful guide for moving through this phase.

Policymakers and their staff would be well advised to involve respresentatives of local districts, institutions of higher education, parent and professional organizations, as well as other key individuals, in considering the issues during this phase. The involvement of others will ensure more in-depth analysis of issues and implications from a variety of perspectives. Also, the representatives will provide a mechanism for communicating information to the organizations and agencies.

Special Policy Concerns For Gifted And Talented Education

The list of policy concerns in the Appendix to this section was derived from policy documents (statutes, rules and regulations, board policies, etc.) from over twenty states. None of the states address all of these issues in their policies, so the list is not meant to be a checklist of everything you should cover. Rather, its purpose is to help you think about the various aspects of education for the gifted and talented. A few of the issues may be appropriate for inclusion in your state's statutory language, but most are too detailed for legislation and belong instead in rules and regulations, or guidelines.

Outlined below are some of the most troublesome policy concerns. Policymakers and staff will need to give special consideration to these areas before drafting policies.

Minimum Program Standards. While minimum standards for programs should be set by the state, those standards must be reasonable. Committee members and staff who develop the draft standards should not try to be too specific in setting requirements. Stringent standards alone will not create quality programs. Training, technical assistance, adequate funding, local commitment and time are also needed.

Standards are useful in nudging program administrators to continually improve their programs. The standards can also encourage practices that may seem unnecessary at first but are, in fact, instrumental to long-term program success. Some of the practices, with comments related to state standards, are outlined below.

Defensible Curriculum and Instructional Strategies. Special programs for the gifted and talented are being established because these children have unique educational needs. If the curriculum and instruction offered in the "gifted" class are not very different from what is provided in the regular classroom, then the special program cannot be justified. Further, gifted children do not come with standard characteristics and needs. They are remarkably different from each other. So individualized instruction, even in "gifted" classes, is essential. The state's minimum standards should define what the state expects in terms of the differences between regular instruction and gifted and talented programs, and what the state considers to be minimum provisions for the individualization of instruction.

Continuum of Services to Meet Different Needs. Again, because gifted children have such wide variations in learning abilities, a single program model cannot adequately meet their needs. Two hours a week of special instruction may be appropriate for a mildly gifted child who needs to develop independent study skills and to explore a special interest area. This part-time class would not be adequate

for a highly gifted second grader who is reading seventh grade books and does math on the sixth grade level. Such a child would need a variety of adjustments to his/her curriculum if instruction is to proceed at the appropriate level and pace.

Integration of Special Programs with Regular Instruction. Some joke about gifted education being "ahead" of education for the handicapped because we have been "mainstreaming" all of the gifted children for years. Because of inadequate support there have been very few special programs in the past, so there was no option but to keep gifted children in the regular classroom all of the time.

Some of the special programs developed for the gifted have been criticized for being too separate from the regular class. State standards should discourage gifted program isolation and encourage integration. In particular, caseloads and student/teacher ratios should be set so that the "gifted teacher" has enough time to talk to the regular teachers, to inform them on what their gifted children are doing in the special program and to help them modify the regular curriculum so that it is more appropriate for their children with outstanding abilities.

State standards may also directly encourage or require integration with the regular program through provisions for periodic meetings between regular and special teachers, team teaching, periodic involvement of not-as-exceptional (i.e., average and above average) children in some of the special activities of gifted programs.

Identification Procedures. During Phase Two (if not earlier) your state prescribed a definition for gifted and talented children. If you are not careful with the development of identification procedures, you may create another definition. For example, your state may wish to recognize a wide range of abilities through a broad definition. But if your standards regarding identification only address the assessment of academic or intellectual abilities, then you are, in fact, using a narrow definition. In other words, your policies regarding identification will determine the *actual* definition of gifted and talented that will be practiced at the program level.

So your efforts in addressing this issue should focus on helping translate the state's definition so that program developers and implementers will know how to identify the children your state considers to be gifted and talented. Naming various sources of data and techniques for data collection will assist districts in implementing state policies. Include some of the non-standardized identification procedures, such as use of community and peer nominations, auditions, expert judgement of student products and autobiographies. This will encourage districts to make an effort to find those gifted children missed by standardized tests.

Your policies on identification should describe the process districts and schools should use, beginning wtih a screening of all students. The policies should also offer guidance on *how* final decisions regarding placing children in special programs should be made. You may wish to require that a team of persons be involved in placement decisions. The policies should also suggest a procedure placement teams can use to ensure that all data regarding a child's abilities, not just standardized test scores, are used in making decisions.

Qualification and Certification of Educational Personnel. Certification of teachers for gifted and talented education is rapidly becoming an issue of concern. From NASBE's experiences, however, certification is a secondary issue. The primary issue is adequate training opportunities. It is a mistake to require certified teachers when there are not enough training programs for those teachers. Most of the states which require certified teachers have a funding system which reimburses local districts for the salaries and benefits of those special teachers. Hence, certification is one of the ways the state controls the use of funds so that unqualified persons are not labeled "teachers of the gifted" for the purpose of securing state reimbursement.

If setting state standards for the qualifications and certification of gifted education personnel will encourage more training programs in this area, then such standards should be developed. But in setting personnel policies, we can take a lesson from what has happened over the years with education of handicapped children. All regular teachers and administrators need to know about the basic needs of gifted and talented children and should have received adequate training on how to meet those needs. Persons who are trained to provide special instruction to the gifted should have appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes to work with regular school personnel in providing for the needs of gifted and talented children. Finally, communication between specialists and regular teachers will be much better if the specialists were (or still are) regular teachers. Thus, instead of certifying teachers for the gifted and talented exclusively on the basis of course hours, states may wish to require teachers in this area to have first demonstrated success in teaching before going on for specialized training.

There is another issue of growing concern regarding certified personnel and gifted programs. Schools are finding that sometimes they must turn to the community to find the expertise needed to offer advanced instruction in subject areas and the arts. Educators of the gifted are also using internship/mentorship experiences outside the school as excellent, low-cost programs to meet the needs of older gifted students. While most schools are able to use community resources without "tripping over" certification requirements, there are limits. States may want to consider policies which give greater flexibility in using non-certified personnel for teaching gifted students.

Procedural Safeguards. It may seem a bit strange to talk about procedural safeguards for protecting gifted and talented children. Being labeled "gifted" is certainly not the same as being called "handicapped." Still, the states need to protect the rights of gifted children against:

- **Discriminatory Testing Procedures or Devices.** Since most standardized intelligence and achievement tests have not eliminated all cultural biases, culturally different children are less likely to demonstrate their abilities on the tests and are likely to have lower scores. Alternatives for finding children with outstanding abilities are available and should be utilized.
- **Unfair Exclusion from Special Programs.** No single criterion should be used in deciding which children will be included in a gifted and talented program. Children who evidence outstanding abilities in some situations but not others (e.g., at home but not at school, or in the classroom but not in a testing situation, etc.) should be given the benefit of the doubt and included in the gifted programs, at least on a trial basis.
- **Permanent Labeling.** A child who is identified as gifted, and those who are not, should be reassessed every few years. The growth spurts and lags which occur throughout the development of all children may make special programs necessary for a period of time, and unnecessary later. Almost all identification procedures have serious limitations so that they miss many gifted children. If a child fails to meet the criteria one year, they should not be forever excluded from special programs.
- **Exclusion of Their Parents in the Process of Screening, Assessing and Placing Children in Special Programs.** Gifted children, particularly the very young, the less motivated, or the culturally different, may reveal their outstanding abilities only in the home or community. Thus, parents are invaluable sources of information for screening and assessing gifted children. If they feel that the school has not noticed or has ignored their child's unusual abilities, they have the right to present information they have regarding the child and that information should be used in making a placement decision.

Summary of Phase 3: Refining and Expanding Policies

Goal:

To continue the policy development process by completing the details of policies that will be articulated through legislation, rules and regulations, board policies, and/or guidelines.

Issues To Be Considered:

Priority rating of issue

Basic goals for state in gifted and talented education

Current policies and programs at state and local level

State needs and resources as identified in Phase One

Political and economic factors, both those that would constrain and those that would support policy and program improvements

Basic policy decisions made during Phase Two.

Decisions To Be Made

For each of the seven policy issues (see Appendix), and the concerns listed under them, you must decide:

- Is the issue currently addressed in state policies? If it is, then do those current policies need any revisions, or need further study for potential revisions?
- If the issue is not currently addressed, then do you wish to take a position on the issue? If so, should you articulate the policies through legislation, rules and regulations, guidelines and/or some other policy document?
- What position would you like to take on an issue, and what degree of specificity do you wish to see in state policies?

Suggested Process:

1. Policymakers and key staff go through issue areas and state preferences at the outset regarding inclusion of the issue, position to be taken and degree of specificity desired.
2. Staff sketches out an initial outline of requirements they would like to see for each issue that is to be addressed in state policies. Then, with "in-house" staff, and maybe a few select advisors such as representatives of key advocate groups and recognized state leaders in gifted education, they examine the initial outline and:
   - Look at the resources that would be necessary to implement the contemplated policies. This is not meant to be a formal cost/person hours impact study, just a rough analysis and rating of the difficulty in achieving implementation.
   - Analyze requirements to see if, individually and collectively, they are consistent with basic state policy decisions made previously. For example, if weak identification procedures are seen as a critical statewide need, then will the contemplated policies help address that need or has the focus of the policies leaned too heavily in another direction?
   - Rethink the contemplated policies and make revisions as needed based on their analysis. Some policies will be critically important, such that they should be kept even if they are likely to be unpopular or difficult to implement. Other requirements included in the initial outline may be less necessary and can be dropped or de-emphasized.
3. Staff develop the first draft of the legislation, rules and regulations, board policy, for review by the appropriate policy body.

4. The policy body (e.g., legislative committee, state board of education) reviews the first draft and suggests revisions to be made by staff in the second draft.
5. The second draft is reviewed by the policy body, then presented to the public for their comments.
6. The second draft is revised by staff based on the public comments.
7. The final draft is adopted by the appropriate policy body.
8. The policies are reviewed on a periodic basis to determine if revisions are necessary.

Appendix

Policy Concerns

1. Minimum Program Standards

- The difference in instruction for gifted and talented children and basic instruction, both at the elementary and at the secondary level
- The types of programs that could be implemented by local districts in order to meet the different needs of gifted and talented children, and any requirements regarding the range or variety of programs that must be made available
- Requirements related to individualized education programs
- Class size and caseloads for different program options
- Provisions for culturally different, economically disadvantaged or handicapped gifted children
- Requirements related to the integration of gifted and talented programs with regular school classes and activities
- Age ranges for services
- Provisions for experimental programs
- Provisions for community involvement, and parent involvement in the special programs
- Requirements regarding program evaluation

2. Identification Procedures

- Procedures for screening potential gifted and talented children, and assessment devices to be used during this phase
- Procedures for assessing abilities of children screened for gifted and talented programs, including requirements for placement committees and criteria which are to be considered in making final decisions

3. Qualifications And Certification Of Educational Personnel

- Personnel conducting screening, assessment and placement procedures
- Classroom teachers
- Support personnel
- Paraprofessional personnel
- Non-educators who assume roles as special resource persons, or as part-time instructors in programs

4. Procedural Safeguards

- Requirements related to the school's communication with parents before assessment, before the placement of a child in a special program, and before a child is moved from a special program back into the regular program
- Due process procedures for parents who disagree with the school's decision regarding placing or not placing their child in a gifted and talented program
- Provisions to ensure non-discriminatory testing and placement
- Provisions related to the confidentiality of records

5. **Funds For Operation Of Programs**
   - Methods for the distribution and allocation of funds
   - Computation formulas for the amount of allocation
   - Financial accounting procedures
   - Funds for transportation, administration and other allowable expenditures
   - Procedures for local applications for state funding, both requirements for information and the process of application approval

6. **Responsibilities Of Education Agencies**
   - Responsibilities of the state board of education
   - Responsibilities of the state department of education: policy administration and monitoring; technical assistance and training; periodic evaluation; updating of implementation plan
   - Roles of advisory groups, membership, selection procedures, terms of service, responsibilities, procedures for making recommendations

7. **Other State Policies And Special Programs Related To The Education Of Gifted and Talented Children**
   - Summer programs for the gifted and talented (e.g., school for the arts, Governor's Honors Programs) and policies related to the operation of those programs
   - School year programs conducted on a state-wide or regional basis for gifted and talented children, and policies related to the operation of those programs
   - Policies related to alternative approaches for meeting requirements for high school graduation, early admission to kindergarten and first grade, and provisions for grade skipping

Phase 4: Translating Policies Into Practice

So much time and hard thinking goes into developing policies that by the time the drafting, rewriting, reviewing and approving process is completed, policymakers and staff are exhausted. But policy development is not an end unto itself. It is a means for improving education. We know this but still seem to repeat the mistake of letting our energy and enthusiasm fizzle out during implementation.

There is no guaranteed cure for "implementation fatigue." However, there are some measures that may help prevent, or at least reduce, the problem. One way is to develop a state implementation or action plan while you are in the final stages of developing or revising policies. If you decide that you do not need to alter state policies, you may want to develop an action plan for addressing state needs as identified in Phase One.

NASBE has examined existing state plans for gifted and talented education and has some observations that may be useful.

State Plans

Existing state plans for education of gifted and talented children have had a mixed history of success. Some plans were written by persons who clearly understood their state's politics, and its needs and resources, and intended to develop a realistic plan. Other plans amounted to little more than the "wish lists" of their formulators who tried to address all of their state's needs at once. None of the state plans have been rated by their states as having been the absolute key to their success.

Some states have developed a plan for gifted education that served as an extension of the state's legislative and regulatory provision. They believe that plans should elaborate state policies on key program issues such as identification; standards for programs; selection and training for staff; and staff reimbursement and

monitoring procedures. In these policy-oriented plans, the responsibility for implementation basically rests with the local education agencies. There may be some reference to the responsibilities of state education agencies, but for the most part, activities to be carried out by state leaders are not addressed in the plan.

Other state agencies have sought to improve gifted education by carefully structuring their own actions through a state plan. These plans focus less on the policy issues and standards for programs, and more on the activities and objectives to be accomplished by the state department staff, a state task force or other agencies. A few states have both policy statements and state-level action plans in their state plan for gifted and talented education.

The states not only vary in their basic approach to providing leadership through the state plan, they also differ in the degree of specificity of the policies and/or activities outlined in the plan. Most of the plans establish very broad goals with objectives and strategies that are also very general. Some omit deadlines or set large blocks of time for attaining a given objective. Other states have highly specific goals, objectives and activities such as one would find in a PERT chart or a detailed management plan.

A plan which is primarily designed to guide statewide activities, rather than elaborate state policies, and which specifies goals, actions and timetables is most likely to be a useful implementation plan. This type of plan can: 1) rank activities that are the responsibility of state staff so that they can systematically accomplish the many tasks that demand their attention; 2) rank uses for limited state funds for training, technical assistance and other services; and 3) coordinate actions with timetables for the legislature and the school calendar.

If an action/implementation plan as described above would be helpful in guiding your state's efforts for the gifted and talented—then you may wish to consider the following suggestions for developing that plan.

- **An action/implementation plan should minimize verbage.** It is a work plan, not an essay.
- **The plan should limit the scope of work through clearly defined objectives, tasks and deadlines.** The objectives should be written so that they are measurable. For example, instead of "state will improve inservice training opportunities" you should write, "during the first year the state will provide three regional workshops for regular school personnel, six statewide topical workshops for directors and teachers of gifted programs, and two regional workshops for parents." By writing quantifiable tasks and objectives you will be able to measure the progress you are making (or not making) in following the plan.
- **Wherever possible, the costs of planned activities should be estimated so that you can complete priority activities within the limits of your budget.** Knowing the costs of anticipated activities will also help in justifying budget requests to state boards and state legislatures.
- **Timetables should be set carefully for each activity so that deadlines can be met and "person hour" requirements for state staff are well distributed over the year.** The objectives of the plan which involve the state legislature and/or local school personnel should have timetables compatible with their schedules. For example, if you want to increase awareness of the characteristics of gifted children and involve "regular" teachers in the identification process, plan those workshops so that the teachers attend and then observe their students before the cycle of screening-identification-placement for gifted and talented programs begins. If you want to build legislative support for gifted and talented education, schedule awareness building activities so that interest is stimulated (or renewed) among educators and lay citizens just before the start of the legislative session.

- **The plan must have credibility.** Key education leaders, administrators, teachers, parents, advocate/professional organizations, etc., should be involved in the plan's development.

Continued Support From Policymakers

Even with a well-designed action/implementation plan, staff will still experience implementation fatigue. You as policymakers have a vital support role to play to keep the momentum up through the "middle miles" of your state's efforts for the gifted and talented. Specifically you should:

- Stay informed on how the policies are working at the state, local district and building level. Ask staff to prepare brief, periodic reports. They may not enjoy the extra work, but they will appreciate your interest.
- Publicly express your support for the policies so that education leaders, administrators, parents and others will know that the state intends to see something happen.
- Work to secure financial support for programs, for state staff who are needed to administer and coordinate the programs, and for training and technical assistance activities so essential for building quality in state and local efforts.

A single policymaker or educational leader can make a significant difference in what happens educationally for our gifted and talented youngsters. There is a great deal of quiet commitment and interest, but the issue needs more open support and leadership.

Summary of Phase 4: Translating Policies Into Practice

Goal:

To ensure that the policies developed or revised during Phases One through Three will be successfully implemented

Issues To Be Considered:

Same issues as were involved in Phases One through Three, with particular attention paid to political and economic factors throughout the state that may constrain program implementation

Decisions To Be Made:

Do you want to develop a state action/implementation plan? If "yes" what will be the purpose(s) of the plan and how can it be designed to meet that purpose(s)?

How can policymakers and top-level administrators best provide long-term support for gifted and talented education given the numerous other concerns and responsibilities they have?

Suggested Process:

1. If your state decides to develop a plan, then staff, with input from policymakers, should determine the purpose(s) of that plan by:
   - — Examining new policies which have been, or are about to be, adopted to determine what actions must be taken at the state level to ensure implementation;
   - — Discussing the new policies with key local educational leaders, teachers and advocates to solicit their ideas on possible "problem spots" with implementation and what could be done at the state level to prevent or reduce those problems;
   - — Reviewing state needs as identified in Phase One and determining which needs will not be addressed through policies but instead require the provision of services (e.g., training, technical assistance) or new resources from the state level.

2. After articulating the purposes of the plan and securing approval as needed, staff should design the format and determine the level of specificity for the plan. They should then draft a plan and seek feedback from policymakers, key local educational leaders, teachers and advocates regarding the draft.
3. The plan is reviewed, revised as needed, and then adopted by the appropriate policymaking or administrative review body. In most cases the state board of education should approve the plan. If the plan only directs the activities of state department staff, it may be an administrative concern which will not be reviewed by the Board. Board involvement in developing and approving the plan will help strengthen their support and sense of responsibility in ensuring effective implementation of state policies.
4. The plan is reviewed on a periodic basis, preferably each year, and is revised as needed.

Conclusion

You as a policymaker have the important task of strengthening your state's program for educating gifted and talented children. Please do not wait to take action because the issues seem complicated (since when were education issues easy?) or because you are not sure what should be done in this area. Children who happen to have brighter minds or special talents should not be doomed to years of boredom and frustration in your schools.

Promoting state support and leadership in education of gifted and talented children is not that difficult. You simply must allow enough time to gather and sort through the information you will need for making decisions, and lining up support for those decisions. Begin by following the process suggested in each Summary Section of this article. With patience, persuasion, and perseverance, you should be able to develop and implement policies that will move your state forward in educating your most able students.

California State Profile

Jack Mosier

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

AB 1040, which became effective in the 1980-81 school year and repealed the Mentally Gifted Minor Program, is based on reform legislation supported by parent and professional advocacy groups. The new law substitutes a four-year gifted and talented pilot program for the districts previously enrolled in what was referred to as the old Mentally Gifted Minor program.

AB 1040 is California's first "sunset bill," a concept endorsed and supported by the statewide advocacy group. The new program will remain in effect until 1986 and will end after that date unless specifically continued by the legislature. Continuation will depend upon the results of an outside evaluation. The evaluator will examine the benefits, costs, consequences, and impact of the program, provide information on these issues and make appropriate policy recommendations in a report to be presented to the Legislature in 1984.

AB 1040:

- Improves the quality of existing programs, provides for experimentation in program approach and costs levels, and ensures full participation of pupils from economically disadvantaged and varying cultural backgrounds;
- Supports unique opportunities for high-achieving and under-achieving pupils who are identified as gifted and talented;
- Places responsibility for identification of gifted students at the school district level in one or more of the following areas: "intellectual, creative, specific academic or leadership ability, high achievement, performing and visual arts talent";
- Establishes a new formula for apportionment of program funds; specifies that funds will be distributed by program rather than by student and will be equalized so that each participating district will eventually receive an amount in proportion to its percentage of statewide average daily attendance;
- Requires that parents be involved in the ongoing planning and evaluation of programs;
- Restricts the use of state funds for field trips;
- Limits the total expenditures to a maximum of $250 per child;
- Specifies that curriculum components shall be determined by local school districts;
- Requires districts to designate someone with responsibility at the district level for development and implementation of the program and for maintaining auditable records.

The Legislature is committed to the belief that programs for gifted and talented pupils should include all of the following:

- Differentiated opportunities for learning commensurate with the gifted and talented individual's particular abilities and talents;
- Alternative learning environments in which gifted and talented individuals can acquire skills and understanding at advanced ideological and creative levels commensurate with their potential;
- Elements that:
  1. help the gifted and talented develop sensitivity and responsibility to others;
  2. help to develop a commitment in gifted and talented individuals to constructive ethical standards;
  3. assist the gifted and talented in developing self-generating problem-solving abilities to expand each pupil's awareness of choices for satisfying contributions in his or her environment;
  4. help gifted and talented pupils develop realistic, healthy self-concepts.

Statistical Profile

Total number of K-12 children:	4,500,000
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	150,000
Total number of school districts:	1,040
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	402
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	3%
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented in programs:	75% gifted 25% talented
Approximate percentage distribution of programs among grade levels:	50% each in K-12 and 7-12

Identification Procedures

The legislation requires that each district use one or more of the following categories to identify pupils as gifted and talented. In all categories, identification of a pupil's extraordinary capability must be in relation to their chronological peers:

- **Intellectual Ability.** A pupil demonstrates extraordinary potential for intellectual development.
- **Creative Ability.** A pupil characteristically perceives unusual relationships among aspects of the pupil's environment and among ideas; overcomes obstacles to thinking and doing; and produces unique solutions to problems;
- **Specific Academic Ability.** A pupil functions at highly advanced academic levels in particular subject areas.
- **Leadership Ability.** A pupil displays the characteristic behaviors necessary for extraordinary leadership.
- **High Achievement.** A pupil consistently produces advanced ideas and products and/or attains exceptionally high scores on achievement tests.
- **Visual and Performing Arts Talents.** A pupil originates, performs, produces, or responds at extraordinarily high levels in the arts.
- Any other category which meets the standards set forth in these regulations.

Each school district has the option prior to identification to collect data that will include pertinent evidence about a pupil's capability. Evidence must include data which indicate an excellence or a potential for excellence far beyond chronological peers. Data may be collected by the school district from among school, class, and individual pupil records; individual tests (including summary and evaluation by credentialed school psychologist); group tests; and interviews and questionnaires (teacher, parent, and others).

Evidence of a pupil's capability may be also derived from pupil products, comments from peers, and opinions of professional persons. Studies of the factors contributing to a pupil's underachievement and studies of a pupil's underachievement resulting from handicapping or disadvantaged conditions are considered where pertinent. In all cases, the information must reflect consideration of the economic and cultural characteristics of the pupil's background.

The final determination of a pupil's eligibility for gifted and talented programs rests with the administrative head of the school district or a designated employee of the district in accordance with procedures adopted by the local governing board.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. **Allocation**

The state will allocate $15,000,000 to the program for school year 1980-81. This amount will be increased in ratio to the percentage of inflation in the preceding years. Total expenditure is limited to $250 per child. Local school district contributions have been estimated at an additional $4 million to $6 million.

B. **Distribution**

Funds will be distributed to school districts on the basis of their average daily attendance, and apportioned by the state superintendent based on a written district program which describes the different curricula.

State Central Services

The Department of Education has the responsibility to assist local governing boards to design, implement, and evaluate programs funded with the state apportionments. They have as additional responsibilities the encouragement of the development of locally designed innovation programs, the development of staff development programs and the providing of technical assistance. When asked to do so, the Department will also monitor the program using a written plan (See "Evaluation").

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. **Program Standards**

The following general standards will apply to all types of programs:

1. A major priority shall be to improve the quality of existing programs for gifted pupils.
2. Experimentation with a variety of programmatic approaches and cost levels shall be encouraged.
3. Districts shall make provisions for ensuring full participation of pupils from disadvantaged and varying cultural backgrounds.
4. Written consent of a parent, guardian, or other person having actual custody and control of the pupil's participation in the program.
5. The district program shall meet the specific needs and requirements, as specified in the Education Code. Academic components shall be included in all program offerings.
6. All identified gifted and talented pupils shall have an opportunity to participate in the gifted and talented program.
7. The program must be provided for a minimum of 200 minutes per week for 30 weeks per school year.

B. **Current Programs**

The new law provides program options that may include special day classes, part-time grouping, enrichment activities, cluster grouping, independent study, acceleration, etc., and others consistent with State Board regulations.

Professional Preparation

Teacher selection is the responsibility of the local school districts based on the following requirement: all teachers and supervisors whose major assignment is education of mentally gifted minors shall be required by the superintendent of their district to have demonstrated appropriate characteristics, knowledge, and skills related to the field of education for the gifted. This requirement may be met by completion of one of the following:

- an M.A. degree from an accredited education institution, with emphasis in teaching the gifted student;

- demonstrated knowledge and skills gained through experience and/or inservice education which are certified by the district superintenent to his or her board as being adequate to the teaching assignment;
- a Specialist Instruction Credential authorizing the teaching of the gifted.

Program Evaluation

A key provision of AB 1040 is that a contract for an independent evaluation must be made prior to the beginning of the 1980-81 school year. The evaluation will examine the benefits, cost, consequences, and impact of gifted and talented education and shall provide information on these issues and make appropriate policy recommendations in a report to the legislature in January, 1984. The program's continuation will depend upon the results of this evaluation.

When requested, the Department of Education will also monitor program standards, using a written plan. The plan should include:

- The purposes of the program, including the general goals and specific objectives which pupils are expected to achieve;
- The rationale for the district's method of identification of gifted and talented pupils, in keeping with the guidelines developed by the State Board of Education;
- Where appropriate, procedures for the consideration of the identification and placement of a pupil who was identified as gifted or talented in the district from which the pupil transferred;
- The services to be rendered and the activities to be included for pupils participating in special day classes, receiving special services, or participating in special activities for an amount of time as specified;
- A plan for evaluating the various components of the program. Evaluation shall include an annual review of pupil progress and of the administration of the program;
- Procedures for modifying the district program on the basis of the annual review;
- A staff development plan based upon a needs assessment which includes specification of requisite competencies of teachers and supervisory personnel;
- Procedures for ensuring continuous parent participation in recommending policy for planning, evaluating, and implementing the district program;
- A procedure to inform parents of a pupil's participation or nonparticipation in the gifted and talented program;
- An objective-related budget.

Degree of Service Provision

The current program serves 150,000 identified students, or 3.3 percent of the state's K-12 population of 4.5 million. The state expects to serve 150,000 gifted and talented K-12 students in the 1980-81 school year through the 402 school districts in the program. It is estimated that 90 percent of those eligible will be served.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

The Program for Gifted in California began in 1957 as a response to Sputnik, when the California Legislature sponsored a three-year study of gifted programs. By the mid-1960's, a number of district programs were operating for the top 2 percent of students identified as mentally gifted minors (MGM). In 1971, the California Legislature enacted permissive legislation supportive of state-funded programs for up to 8 percent of the state school population. The MGM legislation provided apportionment allowances at a maximum rate of $100 per pupil per school year.

Legislative awareness of the needs of gifted resulted in 345 local districts conducting uniquely appropriate programs for over 180,000 public school pupils. By school year 1976-77, 4 percent of the state school population had been identified and was being supported at a funding level of approximately $80 per pupil. State support for identification and program costs reached $15 million in 1977-78 —the high water mark of the present program.

By the mid-1970's, it became apparent that the law governing MGM programs was written in such a limiting manner that it was impossible for local school districts to serve both the needs of the academically gifted and the needs of those pupils identified as talented by studies of the late 1960's and early 1970's. The legislation provided a funding level that was inadequate to serve all students identified by school districts.

With the support of the State Department of Education, the California Association for Gifted and the parent groups in the state, legislation to raise funding levels and broaden the intent of the program was presented to the Legislature. Three times a bill supportive of gifted and talented children reached the Governor's desk and three times it was vetoed.

Pressures to change came from a number of sources—the State Auditor General, the legislative Analyst's Office, the Governor's Office, individual legislators, school districts, individual parents, and a committee of the State Board of Education. Newspaper articles and a national professional magazine questioned the existing MGM program. The fact that many local school districts had failed to respond to the needs of a rapidly diversifying population added to the problem.

In February 1978, with the assistance of the California Association for the Gifted (CAG), a dedicated group of parents began a remarkable effort to save the California program for gifted and talented pupils. With the help of CAG, the parents teamed up with a dedicated Assemblyman, Dennis Mangers, to write and lobby for reform legislation. The result was that Assembly Bill 1040, effective June 30, 1980, was passed and signed by the Governor. Gifted advocates expect that the independent evaluation provided for in the new law will validate the need for gifted and talented education and guarantee the program's continuation.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

The strongest component of California's success in developing new legislation for gifted and talented education has been the efforts and support of parents. Their concern for the education of their children has not fluctuated with changing needs at the state level or shifts in popular support from one education idea to another. Their dedication has been consistent and their growing expertise in the political arena remarkable. As a result of the cooperative arrangement between parents and professionals, the California advocacy movement has grown stronger and become a united voice in support of gifted education.

Connecticut State Profile

William Vassar

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

The basic objective of the bill was to include all exceptional children and youth under an umbrella bill and allow excess cost reimbursement for each exceptionality. It was to become known as a "special education umbrella bill" which mandated that school districts provide programs and services to the handicapped, and permitted school districts to provide special education to gifted and talented children and youth.

The statutory component in Connecticut is part of the total exceptionality statute. There are two basic differences in the gifted and talented component: (1) it is permissive and (2) it must be done "as part of the public school program."

This component represents an essential part of the State Board of Education's effort to initiate, expand and improve special programs and services to its children and youth with *extraordinary learning ability and outstanding talent in the creative arts*. Section 10-76 of the Connecticut General Statutes (a-j) is considered to be exemplary for the gifted and talented because of the broadened concept of definitions approved by the State Board of Education and General Assembly:

- "Extraordinary learning ability" is deemed to be the power to learn possessed by the top five percent of the students in a school district as chosen by the special education planning and placement team on the basis of (a) performance on relevant standardized measuring instruments or (b) demonstrated or potential academic achievement or intellectual creativity.
- "Outstanding talent in the creative arts" is deemed to be that talent possessed by the top five percent of the students in a school district who have been chosen by the special education planning and placement team on the basis of demonstrated or potential achievement in music, the visual arts or the performing arts.

A local school district could provide for up to ten percent of its school population, if the broadened concept of each definition is fully utilized. The definitions allow school districts to work with both *demonstrated* abilities and *potential* abilities. The five percent factor is not an automatic or magic figure nor may it be used for one small segment of the definition. The statute specifically requires that all identification criteria must be approved by the State. Identification becomes quite complex in the approval process to prevent loose or unreasonable criteria from being utilized. Another reason that the statute is exemplary is the fact that it was the first state statute in the nation to specifically designate special programming for children and youth with outstanding talents in the creative arts (music, visual arts, and the performing arts) for reimbursement.

Statistical Profile

Total number of K-12 children:	593,757
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	12,000
Total number of school districts:	169
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	114
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	not yet determined
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented programs:	not yet determined
Approximate percentage distribution of programs among grade levels:	not yet determined

Identification Procedures

Responsibility for the screening and identification of eligible children and youth rests with the superintendent of schools or a professional staff member of the school district to whom he or she may delegate this responsibility.

Screening and identification criteria must be based on a study of all available evidence of the pupil's ability and/or potential by personnel qualified to administer and interpret appropriate standardized tests, judge demonstrated ability, potential, intellectual creativity and leadership, and recognize outstanding talent in the creative arts.

Screening and identification criteria for those who are gifted and talented must be approved by the State Department of Education.

Items for consideration in screening and identification criteria include:

A. Extraordinary learning ability, measured by:

- very superior scores on appropriate standardized tests, such as the upper two or three percent of an appropriate criterion group or scores which are at least two standard deviations above the local norms;
- judgments of teachers, pupil personnel specialists, administrators and supervisors who are familiar with the pupil's demonstrated and potential ability;
- intense interest and involvement in a specific intellectual area;
- utilization of a multi-criteria approach, including a number of objective and subjective items such as appropriate check lists, and rating scales.

B. Creative arts ability, measured by the above criteria in combination with, but not limited to, the following additional criteria:

- evidence of advanced skills, imaginative insight, intense interest and involvement;
- judgments of outstanding talent based on appraisals of specialized teachers, pupil personnel specialists, experts in the field and/or others who are qualified to evaluate the pupil's demonstrated and potential talent.

The procedures have been designed to avoid arbitrary cut-off points or limitations.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. **Allocation**

The state program provides for an expenditure of $4,200,000 which is allocated to LEAs according to a reimbursement formula. Local school districts seeking reimbursement from the State Board of Education under Section 10-76 of the Connecticut General Statutes *must submit* an application for prior approval before the program becomes operational.

B. **Distribution**

Reimbursement is based on an excess cost concept, and is not dependent directly on the number of children or ADM. However, reimbursement is only for programs provided for children identified or being evaluated as exceptional children requiring special education. Expenditures for salaries, for example, are special education costs only to the extent that the staff member is actually employed to perform services in an approved program for exceptional children or for the identification of such children.

Special education reimbursement is an addition to the regular ADM grant; it amounts to two-thirds of the school district's "net cost of special education." Net cost is obtained as follows:

a) Total the school district's expenditures for:
special education personnel
special education equipment and materials
special education tuition
special education transportation

special education rent
special education consultant services
special education health services;

b) Total the tuition and all other funds received for the special education program for which reimbursement is being claimed;
c) Multiply the average per pupil cost for all pupils in the school district by the number of pupils whose instruction was provided primarily (two-thirds or more) by special education personnel;
d) Subtract (b) and (c) from (a)

State Central Services

The state program is administered in the Bureau of Pupil Personnel and Educational Services. Responsibility for the complete state program is delegated to the Consultant for Gifted and Talented Programs for the purposes of administration and supervision.

The SEA staff has developed a plan to provide and monitor the following types of inservice training and technical assistance to LEAs, community and parent groups and others.

- *Special Education Resource Center*—a statewide center located in Hartford, with a full-time professional staff, instructional methods center, library and a curriculum file on the gifted and talented, that provides assistance for each exceptionality to professional and lay personnel.
- *Clearinghouse/Resource Center*—a statewide clearinghouse with six regional resource centers located in strategic regions throughout the state. All such facilities have trained personnel, and also maintain libraries and curriculum files for use by professional and lay personnel.
- *Colleges and Universities*—the University of Connecticut maintains a graduate training program from the master's through the doctoral levels. National experts head their instructional staff and the SEA maintains a unique and close working relationship with the state university in providing joint training opportunities and technical assistance to LEAs. The School of Education maintains one of the largest collections of materials and textbooks on the gifted and talented.

  Southern Connecticut State College has developed a master's and sixth-year training program for professional personnel seeking advanced training in the gifted and talented. Course work is also offered at six other public and private institutions.

Program Standards and Current Programs

Programs for pupils in these categories must include the following components:

A. A written plan for the total program submitted to the State Department of Education for prior approval and including the following steps:
   1. Need for program.
   2. Philosophy of program—the selection of students, staff, the development of differentiated curriculum and instruction will be dictated by philosophy of the program.
   3. Goal(s)—program and long range.
   4. Objectives—pupil, teacher, environmental.
   5. Target group(s) of pupils to be served.
   6. Screening and identification procedures—each target group selected must be screened and identified, using multiple criteria, such as intelligence tests, achievement and aptitude tests, check lists and ratings scales, cultural norms or other predictive measures.
   7. Administrative design(s)—may embrace regional centers, resource centers in the school district or within a school, resource rooms, itinerant teacher approaches, community mentors, seminars, etc.

8. Differentiated instruction (program and/or services):
   a. Differentiated curriculum—one that involves experiences and activities which are qualitatively different from those provided in the regular classroom, and involve a high level of cognitive and affective concepts and processes beyond those normally provided in the regular classroom.
   b. Differentiated teaching strategies—teaching strategies which will accommodate the unique learning styles of the target groups being programmed for. For example, utilizing the higher mental processes of analysis, synthesis and evaluative thinking in working with the target group of high achieving, highly motivated children and youth.
9. Amount of time spent by pupils in program.
10. Articulation and coordination.
11. Professional staff qualifications.
12. Special education consultative services.
13. Evaluation.

B. Program Approval

Local school districts seeking reimbursement from the State Board of Education under Section 10-76 of the Connecticut General Statutes must submit an application for prior approval before the program becomes operational. The prior approval application must be in narrative form.

Professional Preparation

No special certification requirements have been established. Teachers should hold a certificate appropriate for the age level of the program and should have professional and personal qualifications judged necessary for work with these children and youth. The teacher should be an individual who has a desire to do this specific work, and has demonstrated this interest by showing an understanding of children as well as by taking graduate courses which are designed to increase this understanding and to develop the competence required to help these children and youth.

Primary requirements for a teacher include: a high degree of self-understanding and security; a warmness toward and acceptance of these pupils; professional background which includes advanced graduate study relevant to the teaching assignment and which increases his or her understanding of gifted and talented pupils; successful regular classroom teaching experience; a willingness to seek further training if needed and recommended; and a willingness to meet regularly with other staff members.

Program Evaluation

Both process and product should be taken into consideration. The program and pupil program should be evaluated in terms of the qualitatively different objectives designed for the program and the children and youth involved, using both objective and subjective processes.

Degree of Service Provision

The State program which involves a statewide expenditure of over $4,000,000, serves over 9000 gifted and talented children and youth in 142 programs covering 114 of the 169 LEAs.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth:

In the late fifties, author John Hershey was appointed chairperson of a special committee of noted educators and lay persons to study the needs of Connecticut's gifted and talented children and youth. The Hershey Report was submitted to the State Board of Education in 1959, but no action was taken.

About six years later, the State Board of Education established the education of the gifted and talented as a priority, adding a full-time position within the Bureau of Pupil Personnel and Special Educational Services. This position was filled in September 1966. Concurrently, the State Board of Education contracted for a comprehensive review of the statutory provisions and regulations for the education of all exceptional children. Dr. R. Daniel Chubbuck, of the University of Bridgeport, was named the principal investigator.

Dr. Chubbuck's report, submitted in 1966, included:

- An analysis of procedures, policies and problems relating to existing legislation, and their effect on the development of adequate educational programs and services for exceptional children;
- An analysis of other conditions which affected the efforts of local educational agencies to provide sound programs and services for all exceptional children;
- A synthesis of the concerns and recommendations of persons interested in exceptional children, including educators, parents, and health, mental health and welfare workers;
- Recommendations to the State Board of Education on legislative policies and procedures aimed at improving the quality of education for all exceptional children.

Dr. Chubbuck consulted with many constituencies while preparing the study, including: State Department personnel; Council for Exceptional Children staff at the national level; local special education personnel; school administrators, university staff; and the Connecticut Legislative Commission, which would be key in shaping appropriate legislation.

Among the most serious gaps uncovered by the study were the absence of legislation to provide for the education of the gifted and talented; conflicts in control; lack of accountability; and inadequate and inequitable funding.

The report, which recommended that all exceptional children be serviced under an umbrella type of state legislation, was approved by the State Board of Education in 1966, and soon after was translated into legislation by the General Assembly.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

The State Board of Education currently supports mandating gifted and talented programs in all LEAs by 1985, and moving to a pre-payment concept rather than a reimbursement factor. Administrative regulations, policies and procedures have been developed with various revisions over the years to reflect the constant changes occurring in the broadening concept of giftedness. Special emphasis is being placed on the development of programs for handicapped-gifted, Spanish-speaking gifted and talented, the development of a peer monitoring system for LEAs and the development of specific materials to provide direction in differentiation of instruction to all target groups of gifted and talented children and youth.

Idaho State Profile

Genelle Christensen

47

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

A series of laws enacted since 1965 form the foundation of state statutory policy. Senate Bill 192, passed in 1965, provided a definition of exceptional children which included those identified as "academically talented as well as those with certain handicapping conditions," including reimbursement for the salaries of some "ancillary" and "itinerant" personnel who provided services. In 1972, House Bill 754 mandated service for all exceptional children and youth. Senate Bill 1362, passed in 1974, changed the funding pattern and expanded the category of "ancillary" personnel to include teachers and supervisors of special education. The bill also provided that students identified as academically talented could be included under the special education section of the State Department of Education. *The Idaho Plan for Gifted and Talented* was approved in September, 1974, and programs were identified in the state's school districts beginning in January, 1975.

Idaho's *Administrative Rules and Regulations for Special Education*, which states policies to be followed, and an accompanying manual, *Resource Manual for Gifted/Talented Programs*, which lists procedural guidelines, do not differentiate between students who are gifted and those who are talented. However, Idaho law defines children and youth who are "academically talented," so the term "talented" would most likely apply to those who are academically or intellectually capable. Nevertheless, the school districts provide programs for students who are also creatively gifted, have potential or demonstrated abilities in leadership, or who have ability in the visual/performing arts.

Statistical Profile

Total number of public school K-12 children:	203,247
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	1,922
Total number of school districts:	115
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	47
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	1.3
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented in programs:	not yet determined
Approximate distribution of programs among grade levels:	not yet determined

Identification Procedures

A comprehensive evaluation of each student referred to as exceptional is required in Idaho. To be eligible for a gifted/talented program, a student must meet *three* of the following criteria:

- Scores at the 98th percentile or above on an individually administered intelligence test.
- Scores at the 98th percentile or above on academic achievement in the majority of areas tested.
- Results of creativity tests or other assessments indicating unusual imagination, advanced insight, innovative or creative reasoning ability, skill in problem solving, and/or high attainment in original or creative thinking.
- Nominations or documented observations by two or more persons recognized by the local Child Study Team as qualified to assess leadership ability, mechanical/motor/manual dexterity of the student, or other areas of either academic or non-academic endeavors. Nominations can be made by parents, community persons, teachers or other school personnel, peers, or by the student him/herself.

- Documentation from one or more experts in a particular field recognized by the Child Study Team in such areas as art, music, drama, speech, language (debate, oratory), or other areas included in the visual/performing arts.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. Allocation

The state expended $1,263,723 for gifted/talented programs in 1979-80, or approximately $657 per child.

B. Distribution

The state funds for gifted/talented programs are distributed through the exceptional child formula, using a weighted unit funding concept based on average daily attendance. State reimbursement of 80 percent of the salaries for approved facilitators of gifted/talented programs is also disbursed to districts. Gifted/talented programs are funded the same way as other special education programs. District requests are reviewed by the State Ancillary Funding Committee.

State Central Services

The state supports 50 percent of a full time equivalency for a coordinator for gifted/talented programs. Additional state and regional special education consultants provide services and resources to school districts for the initiation, establishment, development, implementation and evaluation of these programs.

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. Program Standards

Programs for all exceptional children in Idaho, which include those identified as gifted/talented, are developed on an individual basis. Each student found eligible for Special Education has an IEP developed that is specially related to individual needs, skills, or abilities. The local school district child study team determines eligibility through a total comprehensive evaluation, as required by the state. The IEP goals are developed with input from local school personnel, the student's parents, experts who may be required in areas of specific needs, gifts or talents, and in some cases, the student him/herself. Objectives or strategies to meet the long-range goals can include both in-school and out-of-school activities.

B. Current Programs

Programs may involve acceleration and enrichment activities, and projects where a student works with a mentor on a one-to-one basis, or is involved in community projects or with university programs. Currently, students from Idaho school districts are enrolled in mentor programs such as veterinary medicine, law, politics, computer programming, advanced math/science/economics, and photography and film-making. Other students are involved on area college or university campuses, and/or are working with local, state, or regional professional artists, musicians, and other experts with talents similar to the students' abilities or interests.

Professional Preparation

There are currently no specific certification requirements in Idaho for facilitators of gifted/talented programs. Teachers who hold a standard or advanced Elementary or Secondary Certificate, or an Exceptional Child Certificate are employed by school districts as facilitators for these programs.

Program Evaluation

State policy mandates continuous review and monitoring of all special education programs throughout the state. Program reviews are conducted on a rotating basis so that each district is reviewed at least every three years. The *Special Education Program Review Form* covers areas needed for compliance under state laws and P.L. 94-142. An accompanying instrument, *Special Education Program Review: Gifted and Talented* is used in those districts operating programs for gifted students. This form covers the educational and related services specific to this population of exceptional children and reviews the policies and procedures required for all exceptional children.

Special education central and regional consultants conduct the program review process, using an extended staff in the larger districts, where more programs exist. The extended staff could include regional/local administrators and/or Special Education ancillary personnel, and parent interviewers. Where the program review results indicate additional services or resources are needed or are requested, state department staff consultants provide technical assistance to the district(s), with timetables for follow-up activities, services, or needed areas of compliance. In addition, the annual *Special Education Report to the Legislature* has provided both the Idaho House and the Senate with additional information on gifted/talented programs, increased availability of services, and cost-effectiveness.

Degree of Service Provision

Service provision has grown from 7 percent of the 115 school districts in 1975 to the 40 percent now providing programs for students identified as gifted and talented.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

A statewide effort began with the first *Idaho State Awareness Conference on Gifted/Talented Education* in May, 1975, at Boise State University. Between 250-300 educators, parents, students, legislators and community persons attended the two-day session which created a new statewide awareness. State conferences on gifted/talented have not only increased awareness of the needs of these students, but also have been instrumental in upgrading the quality and increasing the quantity of program operations.

State efforts to provide inservice training opportunities have been conducted largely with federal funds, since state funds are limited to direct service uses.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

Parent groups have been instrumental in program maintenance, especially since the implementation of Idaho's spending limitation referred to as the "1% Initiative" (passed in 1978) and the tentative threat it posed to program expansion for the gifted/talented. Well-informed educators, parents, community persons, and legislators form the foundation for program maintenance, and for the establishment of advocacy groups that will assure continued growth and improvement in educational and related services for gifted/talented children.

The training being made available in gifted education for program facilitators, local administrators, regular education teachers and other interested persons has helped to inform local and regional personnel and parents about the need to serve this population. The positive attitudes expressed by those who work daily with these students, who recognize the need for their gifts and talents, and who are aware of the great need for leadership in our country, are also vital forces for the continuation and improvement of these programs.

Illinois State Profile

Wilma Lund

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

The Illinois Gifted Education Program was established by legislation in 1963. The purpose is to assist and encourage local school districts in the development and improvement of an education program that will increase the educational services of the public schools of Illinois for gifted children. Gifted children as defined in the legislation are those children whose mental development is accelerated beyond the average to the extent they need and can profit from specially planned educational services. (The School Code of Illinois, Chapter 122, 14A)

The legislation authorizes a seven-member Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted Children with seven-year appointments. It is composed of citizens selected, as far as may be practical, on the basis of their knowledge of, or experience in, problems of the education of gifted children.

The Illinois Gifted Education Program is administered in the Department of Federal and State Grants, Educational Innovation and Support Section. State staff include a gifted education coordinator, a program specialist and a program-consultant.

Statistical Profile

Total number of public school K-12 children:	1,983,463
Total number of public K-12 children in FY 81 state gifted/talented reimbursement programs:	70,000 (approximate)
Total number of school districts:	1,010
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	500+
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	5%
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented in program:	
General Intellectual	50%
Specific Aptitude(s)	50%

Approximate percentage distribution of programs among grade levels:

K— 2.3%	7—9.5%
1— 4.5%	8—9.9%
2— 6.0%	9—6.6%
3— 7.3%	10—7.4%
4— 9.9%	11—8.5%
5—10.2%	12—7.8%
6—10.1%	
	100.0%

Identification Procedures

"The Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of the Gifted Education Reimbursement Program" require that districts use multiple identification criteria for the specific categories of giftedness: general intellectual and specific aptitude(s). Cut-off scores based on the performance of the school population are determined by the local education agency. Two methods of reimbursement are allowable:

a. Formula method (a maximum of 5% eligibility of students based on the average daily attendance in the district).
b. Personnel method (qualified professionals).

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. Allocation

The state appropriated $5,703,000 in FY 81 to Local Education Agency reimbursement programs. Regional Gifted Area Service Centers received $800,000.

B. Distribution

These monies funded more than 500 local education agency programs at $77 per identified and participating gifted child. Eight Gifted Area Service Centers received $80,000 each with the ninth and largest urban center receiving $160,000.

Districts apply for reimbursement funds annually. Funds are disbursed according to eligible students claimed and the legislated appropriation.

Gifted Area Service Center contracts are awarded annually on a competitive basis. These centers provide assistance to local district program coordinators in the planning, implementation and evaluation of gifted programs and conduct inservice training for classroom teachers. Centers assist the Illinois State Board of Education in monitoring local programs, disseminating information and ideas on new trends and research in gifted education, and serve as regional advocates for gifted education. They are also responsible for facilitating the establishment of programs for the low-incidence highly gifted student.

State Central Services

The Illinois State Board of Education Gifted Education staff provides technical assistance in program planning and implementation; administers programs including approval of the application for gifted reimbursement funds; conducts onsite monitoring, processes evaluation reports and claim forms; and assists in planning the annual statewide gifted education conferences. They also support the activities of the State Advisory Council on Education of Gifted Children.

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. Program Standards

The Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Gifted Reimbursement Programs describe the program standards against which applications are screened, approved for funding and monitored.

B. Current Programs

Current program development throughout the state is determined by a local assessment with instructional strategies planned and implemented according to the needs of the identified students within the local education agency.

Professional Preparation

Illinois has minimal standards for gifted education personnel who claim state reimbursement funds in excess of $300. Professionals employed in the program must have completed two of the following requirements:

a. Three semester hours or four quarter hours of college credit in gifted education;
b. Completion of a summer training institute for teachers of the gifted;
c. Two years experience in education programs designed specifically for gifted children.

Program Evaluation

When applying for gifted education reimbursement funds, local education agencies must include an evaluation as one of the program components. Schools also complete a separate year-end evaluation report which is filed with the Illinois State Board of Education.

Degree of Service Provision

More than 500 of the 1,010 local education agencies participate in the state reimbursed program serving approximately 70,000 students with $5,703,000 in appropriated state aid.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

The state has funded gifted education programs since 1963 under legislation that has remained virtually unchanged. Article 14A of *The School Code of Illinois* was drafted in the early 60's after a four-year planning study determined the needs of the state's gifted students. In the initial stage of the program (1963-1965 biennium) $1,900,000 was appropriated for the local education agency reimbursement program. Approved programs in fifty-five school districts representing 27 counties received these funds for reimbursement of services and materials.

The State Board of Education identified gifted education as a priority in 1978 and subsequently developed the "Policy Statement on Education of Gifted Children" which contains the following introductory statement:

> "Gifted children are present in all levels of society, within all racial and ethnic groups, and they come from all kinds of homes. The State Board of Education is committed to the principle that all gifted children should receive continuous articulated services appropriate to their needs throughout their elementary and secondary years. It is further committed to ensuring that appropriate gifted education program development occurs within all school districts in the State of Illinois. The Board also acknowledges the need for personnel development, and state and local evaluation of programs, services and results."

Based upon the Illinois State Board of Education Policy Statement on Gifted Education, the Illinois Gifted Education Five-Year Plan has been completed. It serves to guide State, local school district and Gifted Area Service Center staff as they plan and implement programs. Given that the Illinois Gifted Education Program is serving approximately 76% of its eligible students (based upon 5% of the average daily attendance), further growth will be contingent upon heightened awareness and networking efforts of the state staff and other gifted education constituencies.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

The State Board of Education's attention and support for the state gifted program, the extensive press coverage of gifted education, and the networking efforts of the gifted education constituencies have provided an impetus for program growth. The completion of the Illinois Gifted Education Five-Year Plan serves to focus on future program development. This document is a management tool providing a frame of reference for local education agencies participating in the reimbursement program. Illinois educators of the gifted are beginning the new promise of renewed commitment and growth for gifted and talented youth.

North Carolina State Profile

Cornelia Tongue

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

Current legislation and administrative policy governing gifted child education in North Carolina had its origin in 1961 during the era of Sputnik when state law established the Division for the Exceptionally Talented. The words "gifted" and "talented" are used interchangeably, for, at present, the visual and performing arts are not considered part of special education.

The program was rather inflexible and showed little growth until 1971, when funds for gifted programs were combined with those for handicapped children and placed in the Division for Exceptional Children. The State's Equal Educational Opportunities Act (1974) included gifted and talented along with handicapped to receive full, free, and appropriate services. This law was amended in 1977 to bring it parallel to Public Law 94-142. The state law has meant that programs for the gifted share state funds with programs for the handicapped; state special education funding has greatly increased ($105,000,000 in 1980-81); and all due process features that appear in both state and federal law apply to programs for the gifted. State law also created the Council for Children with Special Needs which has become an official advocate for gifted and handicapped children. Legislators, educators, parents, and laymen comprise its membership.

Each year *Rules Governing Programs and Services for Children with Special Needs* is reviewed, revised if needed after public hearings, and approved by the State Board of Education. *Rules* . . . set the policies that implement the laws. Two full-time consultants for programs for the gifted and talented work under the direction of the Director, Division for Exceptional Children.

Statistical Profile (1980-81)

Total number of K-12 children:	1,129,376
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	55,492
Total number of school districts:	144
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	138
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	4.9%

Approximate percentage distribution of programs among grade levels*:

Age*	Number of Students	Percentage
4	6	0.01
5	89	0.16
6	481	0.87
7	1,935	3.49
8	3,997	7.20
9	6,184	11.14
10	6,879	12.40
11	6,890	12.42
12	6,065	10.93
13	6,255	11.27
14	5,346	9.63
15	3,865	6.96
16	3,565	6.42
17	3,349	6.04
18	580	1.05
19	6	0.01
	55,492	

*North Carolina does not gather data by grade; rather it gathers data by age of child on December 1 headcount.

Identification Procedures

Identification of the gifted is based on multiple factors, and made according to all due process procedures prescribed by law. Test data, performance data, recommendations, and biographical data are collected from a pool of all possible candidates and evaluated on a scale which comprises a certain number of points. All students making the cut-off are offered programs and service. The program definition and identification criteria which are used statewide have been approved by the State Board of Education, and no local educational agency may deviate from these without permission of the director of the Division for Exceptional Children. Special efforts are made to identify "experientally deprived" gifted children.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. **Allocation**

The General Assembly appropriates money for children with special needs, and does not earmark categorical funds for the gifted. Almost $18,000,000** of special education money was used for the gifted program in the 1980-81 school year. Some local educational agencies supplement the gifted program with local tax dollars, general education dollars, or from federal program sources such as Title IV-C.

A special appropriation from the General Assembly finances the Governor's Schools of North Carolina. The schools' 1980-81 budget was nearly $530,000.

B. **Distribution**

State monies are distributed to local educational agencies using a formula which allows LEA's to draw funds for their identified gifted students up to 3.9% of their total school population. The superintendent and the local board of education then decide how they will use the dollars among the various special needs program areas. Therefore, the funds drawn based on the gifted population may not be expended on the gifted, but may be used for the handicapped instead.

State Central Services

The State staff for gifted programs perform a variety of functions which include: visitation and observation; technical assistance to local program directors, principals, or superintendents in program planning or program expansion; workshops for gifted and regular teachers; program review and evaluation; development and dissemination of publications, position papers, and identification criteria/standards/procedures; presentations to professional, parent, and lay groups; evaluation of teacher training programs; technical assistance in credit coursework content and instructors; and assistance in the operation of the Governor's Schools. Because North Carolina is a large state, it is divided into eight Educational Regions each with a staff that handles programs for exceptional children. This arrangement greatly improves service delivery to local administrators and teachers.

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. **Program Standards**

The full service mandate coupled with a good deal of local autonomy leaves the types of programs and service up to the superintendent and the local board of education. State law calls for student placement within the "least restrictive alternative." This term translated into a service delivery model means a child may be served in these ways: in the regular classroom by the regular teacher; in the regular classroom by an itinerant teacher; in a part-time special class for one or more hours per day; in a full-time, self-contained class; in a special school; or in a residential setting. Regardless of

**As funds are non-categorical, this figure was arrived at by multiplying the number of gifted teachers by the average teacher's 1980-81 salary.

the level of service, all identified children must have an individualized education program (IEP) prepared prior to receipt of service. Both the gifted/talented teacher and the regular teacher, where applicable, implement the IEP. Parents and, at times, the student have input in the preparation of the IEP.

B. **Current Programs**

The majority of the kindergarten through third grade children are served by the regular teacher. Most of the elementary students receive services from itinerant resource teachers. The majority of junior and senior high students are in a block of part-time gifted classes. A few local educational agencies offer elementary service in self-contained classes or in "magnet schools" (students are drawn from all over the agency). The Governor's Schools of North Carolina are six week summer residential programs funded by the state for 800 secondary students.

Professional Preparation

To be certified, teachers of the gifted need 18 semester hours of work—6 in all exceptionalities and 12 in gifted and talented—in addition to a valid teaching credential. The legislature has generously appropriated funds to help upgrade the competencies of those who work with special children. Special education funds may be used for staff development

Teachers may take college/university courses, attend State Education Agency (SEA) special study institutes, or enroll in SEA approved courses offered by local educational agencies. Seventeen institutions are offering coursework in 1981, compared to an almost nonexistent higher-level program in gifted education in 1972. Three institutions offer a master's program in gifted child education.

Teachers of the gifted may be employed prior to obtaining the gifted/talented credential, but they must have a valid teaching credential to be employed. Local superintendents employ teachers, and they make an effort to obtain highly competent personnel.

Program Evaluation

As a rule, program evaluation rests with the local educational agency. The state agency issues minimum program standards and the State Board of Education's approved state course of study guide which lists minimum competencies. Programs for exceptional children are monitored periodically to see that they are in compliance with the relevant state or federal law. Having 144 local education agencies presents a problem regarding how often programs are evaluated. Evaluation is not connected to funding at present.

Degree of Service Provision

More than 55,000 of the state's total 1980-81 pupil population of 1,129,376 are being served. Additional students had been referred for evaluation or were thought to be gifted. If the current state criteria identify between four and five percent of the total population, the number of gifted students meeting the criteria should fall between 45,175 and 56,468. As more resources become available, more programs will start to meet the full service mandate. Many children now in the program were admitted under former, more flexible identification standards. All students must meet the current criteria when re-evaluated. Although North Carolina has had a history of very fine funding support for programs from the state legislature, insufficient state resources (the 3.9% cap) are still a problem as superintendents strive to offer full and appropriate programs and service. Federal resources from the Office of Gifted and Talented have been regular but have been in small amounts. More funds have come through Title IV-C, than from any other Federal source.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

The inclusion of gifted in law and funding within the exceptional children's programs (see page one of this profile) has meant a unified approach to program development, growth and support. Programs have difficulty in growing without money, commitment from the top policy makers, and harmonious, mutual support of the chief state school officer and his top staff, including the director of the Division for Exceptional Children.

Strong legislative support, and the parent's organizations, the professional organization, local school staff and parents working together all contributed to program success. In isolation, gifted programs would not be where they are today because of the small target population. Combination with programs for the handicapped has brought forward the exceptional children's interest with a strong, united voice.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

North Carolina's gifted and talented program has enjoyed great success because of these factors: a state commitment to the education of its gifted and talented children; strong state agency leadership; cooperation between the different "exceptional" constituencies; and strong advocacy groups. The state backed its commitment with categorical funding for the program early on to insure that gifted and talented education would get off to a good start. Later, gifted and talented programs were included in the same division as programs for the handicapped, and a statewide, cooperative effort of gifted and handicapped advocates lobbied for services for all exceptional children. Other contributing factors included valuable in-service staff development; a well-developed state plan to help teachers become certified; production of educational materials; consistent State Education Agency policies which followed due process procedures described in federal and state law; and technical assistance to local school districts by competent staff in the gifted and talented section.

Ohio State Profile

George Fichter

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

Section 3301.07 of the Ohio Revised Code states in part that the State Board of Education shall:

". . . Encourage the development of special programs of education for academically gifted children, shall employ competent persons to analyze and publish data, promote research, advise and counsel with boards of education, and encourage the training of teachers in the special instruction of gifted children. The Board may provide financial assistance out of any funds appropriated for this purpose to Boards of Education for developing and conducting programs of education for academically gifted children."

The state plan for the education of gifted/talented children states in part: "Because of their unique ability and potential, the gifted and talented require differentiated educational programs and services which may be beyond those normally provided by the regular programs in order that they may realize their fullest contribution to self and society . . ."

Statistical Profile

Total number of K-12 children:	1,900,000
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	30,000
Total number of school districts: (local education agencies)	615
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs: (200 of these have full or partial state funding for the 1980-81 school year)	350
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	not determined
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented in programs:	not determined
Percentage distribution of programs among grade levels:	not determined

Identification Procedures

Ohio uses the U.S. Office of Education definition derived from the 1972 Marland Report. The program standards state that any child who meets the following requirements shall be eligible for programs approved under this standard:

A. Is of legal school age

B. Show evidence of:
   1) functioning in the upper three percent of the student population; or
   2) functioning two standard deviations above the mean on objective test instruments; or
   3) having the potential of functioning within either of these groups.

C. Shows evidence of special abilities determined by the use of multiple criteria, including at least one item from each of the following categories:
   1) nominations
   2) measures of ability on tests
   3) performance and/or interests

The standards define nomination procedures, general types of tests to be used, and cumulative record data, but do not specify certain tests. Local districts follow the same procedures.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. **Allocation**

The state has appropriated a total of $4.675 million for 1979-81 biennial period, $1.35 million for the 1979-80 school year, and an additional $3.325 million for the 1980-81 school year. There is a continuation budget of $3.2 million for the 1981-82 school year.

B. **Distribution**

The $4.675 million funded 75 full-time equivalent teachers and coordinators for the 1979-80 school year and another 100 for the 1980-81 school year. The total funding is determined by calculating the cost of 75 units approved for the 1979-80 school year and 100 additional units approved for the 1980-81 school year. Ohio law defines the formula for determining a unit for gifted talented programs as follows: ". . . The amount shall be the sum of the unit's teacher's training level and years of experience pursuant to section 3317.13 of the Revised Code, plus fifteen percent of such allowance, plus nine hundred fifty dollars."

State Central Services

The State Department of Education provides a state consultant for gifted and talented programs to respond to mail and telephone requests for technical assistance in program development, parent and professional group inservice programs and workshops, and the management of the allocation process for state foundation funds. The consultant also monitors all funded programs individually as appropriate. The Ohio Department of Education sponsors the Martin W. Essex School for the Gifted, a summer experience for 60 gifted eleventh grade students from throughout the state. The school is managed by the state consultant in consultation with faculty from the Ohio State University.

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. **Program Standards**

In addition to a section on eligibility for unit funding described under "Allocation/Distribution of Funds," and student selection criteria described under "Identification Procedures," the program standards also include:

1. Assessment and Placement
   Districts must have written policies to determine eligibility for, and placement of, students in approved programs and services. The programs and services must include program standards, a process for complying with existing state and/or federal guidelines, and priorities for selecting students on the basis of individual needs.
2. Comprehensive Services to the Educational Program
   This section describes the functions of both coordinator and teacher of the gifted and talented. The section also describes services to be provided beyond the normal classroom, including process models, educational experiences, and number of contact hours. Program options described include acceleration, grouping and enrichment.

B. **Current Programs**

Current programs combine acceleration, grouping and enrichment in the elementary grades. The most prevalent service model in Ohio is the cost-effective resource room, which uses one teacher in a centrally-located room to serve 50-60 students per week in groups of 10-12 for up to one day each week per group. This model is modified according to resources available, size of district, geography, and local education philosophy. A few self-contained classes are still in use. Acceleration is being used more frequently, especially in specific curriculum areas for individual students. Secondary programs are typically specific courses offered on an "honors" or advanced

level, acceleration within the school and in college and university programs, independent study, and mentorships.

Professional Preparation

Teachers are selected by local school district representatives for their own programs based on minimum state standards and local criteria. A coordinator must have a master's degree, two years' teaching experience, a valid teaching certificate, and course work in the education and psychology of gifted children. A teacher must have all of the above with the exception of a master's degree.

Program Evaluation

The local school district has responsibility for evaluating individually funded programs. These programs must meet all minimum standards established by the State Board of Education. The state consultant evaluates state-funded programs based on compliance with minimum state program standards.

Degree of Service Provision

This depends upon a realistic assessment of the several program models available and in use. Many gifted and talented children are served through acceleration within the regular educational system. Honors programs and assignment to out-of-school programs and close liaison with community mentors also help meet these children's needs. Maximum service provision will depend upon when and how well all children who have shown ability to perform above the regular curriculum level are integrated into a program designed to meet their individual needs.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

The primary limitations have been inadequate funding and a shortage of qualified teachers. Provision of state program standards and state funding in 1975 spurred local interest, which in turn increased the number of school districts competing for limited state funds. Many school districts shifted priorities to provide initial programs, or in some cases, increased programs, for gifted and talented children. At the same time that this shift in local spending priorities made many districts eligible for state funds, the increased local commitment prompted the Ohio General Assembly to appropriate additional funds. The major obstacle to increased funding may be the traditional and flexible program models in favor of small, self-contained classrooms. Although the established "flexible" programs do provide for more students and consequently a more effective program, the critical factor is the optimum class size regardless of the program model being used.

Stimulants for Change and Growth

The demand for increased state funding has been provided by the large number of districts which have started programs with local funds. This demand, coupled with a more flexible, liberal definition and program, will be instrumental in finally providing permanence to the state program. New Program Standards are being written with "tighter" eligibility requirements. More definitive guidelines for coordinators and teachers are being prepared. Our goal is to provide increased services for gifted/talented students within the regular classroom, thereby using the scarce state dollars for coordinators.

Washington State Profile

Mary Henri Fisher

State Statutory and Administrative Policy

Legislation passed in 1961 established a Division of Special Education for students "of superior capacity" within the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Gifted students are defined as those who "consistently show remarkable performance in academic pursuits or demonstrate exceptional ability." The State Superintendent has the authority to administer the program within the scope of policies and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education. This program includes "conducting, coordinating and aiding in research (including pilot programs); disseminating information to local school districts; and allocating supplementary funds for excess costs when appropriated for this purpose by the legislature."

The funding level is set at up to three percent of the state's academically talented students, or up to 23,000 youngsters. There are no funds for teacher inservice training, evaluation or technical assistance, only for per pupil expenditure. Local school districts, whether separately or jointly, may:

- establish and operate special, seminar or augmented education programs for superior students;
- employ and pay special instructors;
- establish and operate, in conjunction with any institution of higher learning, joint education programs for superior students.

Bills that would mandate gifted education have been introduced in the last two sessions of the legislature but have failed to pass. In the Basic Education Act of 1977 an amendment recognized gifted students but did not obligate funds or require districts to conduct programs.

Statistical Profile (For Fiscal Year 1980)

Total number of K-12 children:	750,000
Total number of K-12 children in gifted/talented programs:	3,800
Total number of school districts:	300
Total number of school districts with gifted/talented programs:	53
Approximate percentage of children served in districts with gifted/talented programs:	86%
Approximate percentage distribution of gifted to talented in programs:	not yet determined
Approximate percentage distribution of programs during grade levels:	98% of programs in elementary grades

Identification Procedures

The *Washington State Guidelines* outlines the state procedure for identifying the gifted and talented. Local districts develop their own identification procedures that function within the state requirement for multiple criteria as a mode of identification.

Allocation and Distribution of Funds

A. **Allocation**

Because each district collects local funding data differently, no reliable figure on total dollars spent is available. In 1981, $1,390,000 of state funds were allotted on an excess cost basis at $225 per identified child, with an additional $25 per student for identification. These funds may be used to identify no more than three percent of the state's academically talented students as specified in the law. Gifted education also benefits from the teacher incentive projects under Title IV-C that are funded annually by the Superintendent of

Public Instruction. Nine mini-grants, as they are called, were funded in the gifted area during the 1979-80 school year for a total of $9,927.

B. **Distribution**

Until gifted education is fully funded, available monies will be distributed by grant allocation. The funding formula serves as a structure until full funding is phased in.

- Districts apply for funding by grant application and are funded on *proof* of appropriate program, based on specific criteria.
- Almost all districts support state categorical programs for the gifted by voluntarily contributing at least half the money received. They raise additional funds for the gifted programs through earmarked levies on local ballot measures.
- Under the funding formula:
  a) districts over 30,000 may be funded up to 180 students, and districts under 30,000 may be funded up to 60 students, provided the total does not exceed the three percent of the population.
  b) at least six grade levels are included in a program with a population over 2,000. In districts with less than 2,000 population, four grade levels would be served.
  c) each student must receive five "contact hours" weekly.

State Central Services

The state office provides inservice workshops on awareness; resources; parent involvement; curriculum principles and development; administration; evaluation and grant development. They work with the legislature and develop budgets; provide materials and resources; plan management systems and make presentations to parent groups and other civic organizations.

Other services include:

- Developing and coordinating conferences
- Soliciting resources, funding, (manpower) support and skills
- Speaking to university classes
- Providing a communications network

Although state policy involves services to the districts, the educational service districts also see this as *their* role, a role which evolves from district needs.

Program Standards and Current Programs

A. **Program Standards**

Washington believes that while all children should have enrichment of some type, gifted children need more in-depth curriculum, and more time to be with their ability peers. Therefore, the gifted curriculum is differentiated from the regular program as opposed to just offering enrichment activities. The program for the academically talented student is designed to serve this population as well as the creative thinker. Identification also supports this emphasis. Standards are determined by policy, program directors, a task force which includes parents, and the superintendent's appointed advisory committee. Each student is in a program at least five hours weekly.

B. **Current Programs**

Many programs use "anchor points" in the curriculum such as patterns, structures, and function. An integrated curriculum is developed which cuts across subject areas or pairs two or more areas, such as "The Patterns in Math and Art." A multi-grade program, which pulls gifted students out of their regular classrooms for a portion of the school week, is the most frequently used program model.

Professional Preparation

No specific certification is required, only a standard teaching credential. The State recommends that teachers employed in gifted programs have any or all of the following:

- successful experience teaching the gifted;
- course work on gifted students and their needs;
- inservice training on the education of gifted students.

At least one course related to gifted education is offered at each state-supported higher education institution. The Superintendent's Advisory Committee on Gifted Education is active in the training/certification/selection process.

Program Evaluation

Washington is moving toward the discrepancy evaluation model—a management system which allows districts to report what they are doing and how they intend to evaluate student growth. The district reports what they are doing in the following areas: 1) district incorporation of gifted programs in general educational programs; 2) identification; 3) student instructional needs; 4) delivery of services; 5) evaluation; and 6) program management.

Data collected then determine the next year's objectives. Teachers, program directors and, in rare cases, outside evaluators collect the information. The state intent is to collect baseline data in 1979-80 from a few programs prepared to report student growth in order to report to the legislature on the effects of funding.

Degree of Service Provision

The state currently serves 3,800 students out of the 23,000 who would be eligible for services under the current definition that limits the gifted population to three percent of the school enrollment.

The Program Past and Future: Historical Summary, Limitations and Obstacles to Growth

No new laws have been passed since enactment of the enabling legislation in 1961. During the 1979 legislative session gifted education was mentioned as a part of legislation resulting from the court ordered funding of basic education by the state. There was a lack of continuous leadership at the state level until 1977. In addition, the student population to be funded was not clearly defined, with estimates fluctuating between three and ten percent.

Disorganization of support groups, an uninformed public and legislature, the view that gifted programs are "elitist," and district pride that rejects the idea that special programs are needed have presented obstacles in the past and probably will continue to do so in the future. However, consistency in definition, support from the superintendent and effective advocacy have brought financial assistance and have begun to combat these obstacles.

Major Stimulants for Change and Growth

Four major factors argue for change and growth in the state's gifted program: 1) the current national focus on quality education; 2) the backlash from Basic Education; 3) a greater awareness by the legislature, as a result of three years of intensive lobbying by parents; 4) the pioneer spirit of the Northwest "to be your own person and be good at it."

About the Authors

Genelle Christensen, Coordinator for Gifted/Talented Programs in Idaho, came to the State Department of Education in 1973 as Special Education Consultant. When the Idaho State Plan for Gifted/Talented was approved by the State Board of Education in 1974, Ms. Christensen became the program coordinator, and was instrumental in the initiation of pilot projects in eight school districts. With Ms. Christensen's leadership, the number of districts with programs has grown from the original eight projects to 47 school districts, and an exemplary inservice training program has been written, presented throughout the state and disseminated to other states. Prior to coming to Idaho, Ms. Christensen was employed as a Program Director in Kankakee, Illinois; as an instructor in a junior high school and as director of a guidance/counseling program which served as a model for elementary grades for the state of Illinois. She has served as a consultant for the University of Oregon and for Science Research Associates, and has conducted workshops and training in both regular and special education for administrators, teachers, students and parents. Ms. Christensen has also served on the Executive Committee on The Association for the Gifted.

George Fichter serves as the Educational Consultant for Programs for Gifted and Talented in the Ohio Department of Education. He plans and directs the Marvin W. Essex School for the Gifted, a statewide annual summer experience for selected students, and contributes to program initiation for the gifted at the local and regional school level. Mr. Fichter has provided direction, coordination and technical assistance to hundreds of local districts throughout Ohio as they started or modified programs for gifted and talented students. For his leadership, he was given the Hall of Fame Award for Distinguished Service from the Ohio Association for Gifted Children in 1979. Mr. Fichter has served as a consultant in gifted education at the local, state and federal level, including serving as a member of the U.S. Department of Education National Advisory Committee on Gifted Education. He has taught in public schools in Pennsylvania and at Kent State University. He is currently a lecturer for the Faculty for Exceptional Children at the Ohio State University. He received his B.S. in Education and Master of Arts degrees from Kent State University and has taken post graduate studies in the Education of the Gifted and Psychology.

Mary Henri Fisher has served as Consultant in the Gifted Program Section of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for six years, and as Director of Gifted Programs for the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction for three years. In her positions in those two states she has conducted direct technical assistance to hundreds of school districts in program development for gifted and talented children. In Washington State, Ms. Fisher was responsible for revitalizing the state supported gifted program including developing local district applications for funding, program guidelines, and evaluation procedures. She organized and conducted numerous in-service workshops, state conferences and two summer institutes. Last year, Ms. Fisher was a National Education Policy Fellow through the Institute for Educational Leadership and served as a Project Director with the National Association of State Boards of Education. She was responsible for directing a project for professional development of state consultants of gifted programs and operating the National Information Center on Gifted Education. Ms. Fisher earned her B.A. degree in Elementary Education at Meredith College and an M.Ed. in Adult Education at North Carolina State University.

Wilma Lund is the Gifted Education Coordinator for the Illinois State Board of Education. Mrs. Lund has extensive experience in gifted education having served as a teacher and administrator since 1970. Under her direction, an intensive cultural field experience, "Bridging the Cultural Gap Across the Miles and Years", was founded for gifted students of Aledo and Mt. Vernon, Illinois. Additionally, Mrs. Lund has served as a consultant to school districts in program development for gifted and talented children with particular emphasis in the social studies. Her achievements and honors in educational endeavors include the first award given for Outstanding Service and Contributions to Gifted Education, Past President of the Illinois Council for the Social Studies, former member of the National Council for the Social Studies Executive Committee and Board of Directors, and Illinois History Teacher of the Year. She has received the Outstanding Educator Award and the Lady of the Year Award presented by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. Additionally, she has authored numerous articles for gifted education and social studies publications, is a frequent public speaker for community groups on gifted education issues, and is co-editor of the bicentennial resource guide for Illinois teachers. She earned her B.S. degree in Education and M.S. degree in Educational Administration from Western Illinois University.

Patricia Bruce Mitchell is the Director of the National Consortium for State Leadership in the Education of Gifted and Talented Children, a joint effort of eight national organizations. In directing gifted programs at the National Association of State Boards of Education for the past four years, Ms. Mitchell has worked in over thirty states providing technical assistance to state leaders on gifted education. Ms. Mitchell is currently on the Board of Governors of the Council for Exceptional Children, representing The Association for the Gifted (TAG) and as Review Editor of *The Journal for the Education of the Gifted.* She has served as an Education Policy Fellow in Gifted Education to the Council for Exceptional Children and as a member of the U.S. Office of Education Task Force on Gifted Education in 1978. Ms. Mitchell earned her A.B. degree at the University of Georgia where she completed a year-long project on creativity under the direction of Dr. Paul Torrance. Her M.S. degree was awarded from the Pennsylvania State University in the Education of Exceptional Children.

Jack Mosier served six years as the southern California consultant for the California Mentally Gifted Minor Program before moving to Sacramento two years ago to serve as the northern California consultant for the new California gifted and talented program and to direct a two-year training project involving three western states. Dr. Mosier began his career in Los Angeles where he served for 25 years as a teacher, Vice-Principal, Principal and school administrator. In addition he has experience as an adult school teacher, a Junior College instructor and as a visiting professional expert at the University level. Dr. Mosier has served as a consultant to several states, conducted numerous conferences, training sessions and workshops and is considered an expert in systematic program planning. He is currently a member of the U.S. Department of Education's Advisory Committee on Gifted and Talented Education. Dr. Mosier received his B.S. and M.A. degrees from the University of Southern California and earned his doctorate at Brigham Young University with a dissertation on the severely gifted child.

Cornelia Tongue has just retired as Consultant for Gifted Programs in the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction after completing thirty-six years in public education. For twelve of those years she was with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, serving as head of gifted programs for ten years. Ms. Tongue helped found the organization, Parents for the Advancement of Gifted Education, and was a charter member of the North Carolina Association for the Gifted. Ms. Tongue has served as a consultant to other states and to national organizations, as a member of the U.S. Department of Education Advisory Committee on Gifted and Talented Education, and as a member of the Education Advisory Committee of the National Business Consortium for Gifted and Talented Children. Ms. Tongue has also been elected to national leadership positions in gifted education including Treasurer of The Association for the Gifted, and President of the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted.

William Vassar has been the State Consultant for Gifted Programs in Connecticut for the past 16 years. He has served in numerous key leadership positions in gifted education over the last two decades including: President of the National Association for Gifted Children; President of The Association for the Gifted; President of the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted; Consultant to the congressionally mandated study on gifted education which was directed by U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland; participant in President Johnson's White House Task Force on Gifted and Talented and coordinator of the 50-state study conducted by the Task Force; co-founder of the National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented; and special consultant to the staff of both the House and Senate on federal legislation for the gifted. Mr. Vassar has served as a consultant to over 20 states in gifted education; provided hundreds of workshops and conference presentations and written over 50 articles on the subject. For his leadership in gifted education he has been awarded the Certificate of Merit from all of the major national organizations in gifted education and has been named Outstanding Connecticut Educator.

Other Publications on the Education of Gifted and Talented Children

By:

The National Association of State Boards of Education

An Administrator's Guide To The Education Of Gifted And Talented Children

By Joyce Van Tassel-Baska

In a concise, to-the-point manner the author outlines the key issues; action steps for setting up a program; and considerations for building an exemplary gifted program. $7.50 per copy prepaid.

An Advocate's Guide To Building Support For Gifted And Talented Education

Patricia Bruce Mitchell—Editor

This guide to selling gifted programs to legislators, board members and administrators presents critical information on what works and what does not work during all phases of advocacy. Articles explain how to organize parent groups, how to lead them through the steps of preparing for and conducting an advocacy effort, and how to give testimony at legislative or school board meetings. $7.50 per copy prepaid.

The National Association of State Boards of Education
444 North Capitol Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5845